1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE GREENEVILLE		
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, . DOCKET NO. CR-2-19-14		
4			
5	GOVERNMENT, .		
6	VS GREENEVILLE, TN . APRIL 8, 2020		
7	XIAORONG YOU, . 1:45 P.M.		
8	DEFENDANT		
9			
10 11	TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE J. RONNIE GREER UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
12	(DEFENDANT PRESENT BY VIDEO CONFERENCE)		
13	(DEFENDANT FRESENT BI VIDEO CONFERENCE)		
	APPEARANCES:		
14 15	FOR THE GOVERNMENT: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OFFICE OF U.S. ATTORNEY		
16	TIMOTHY CURTIS HARKER, AUSA 800 MARKET STREET, SUITE 211 KNOXVILLE, TN 37902		
17	FOR THE GOVERNMENT U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE		
18	VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE: OFFICE OF U.S. ATTORNEY J. DOUGLAS OVERBEY,		
19	UNITED STATES ATTORNEY 800 MARKET STREET, SUITE 211		
20	KNOXVILLE, TN 37902		
21	FOR THE GOVERNMENT U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE - VIA TELEPHONE: (CRIMINAL DIVISION)		
22	COMPUTER CRIME AND INTELLECTUAL		
23	PROPERTY SECTION  MATTHEW R WALCZEWSKI, AUSA		
24	1301 NEW YORK AVENUE N.W., SUITE 600		
25	WASHINGTON, DC 20530		

1		U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (NATIONAL SECUIRTY)
2		NATIONAL SECUIRTY DIVISION, COUNTERTERRORISM SECTION
3		NICHOLAS O. HUNTER, AUSA 950 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N.W.
4		WASHINGTON, DC 20530
5	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	COLLINS SHIPLEY, PLLC COREY B. SHIPLEY, ESQ.
6		128 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SUITE 102 GREENEVILLE, TN 37743
7	FOR THE DEFENDANT	JESSEE & JESSEE
8	VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE:	
9		JOHNSON CITY, TN 37601
10		COLLINS SHIPLEY, PLLC MICHAEL CURTIS COLLINS, ESQ.
11		128 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SUITE 102 GREENEVILLE, TN 37743
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22	COURT REPORTER:	KAREN J. BRADLEY RPR-RMR
23		U.S. COURTHOUSE 220 WEST DEPOT STREET
24		GREENEVILLE, TN 37743
25	PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY PRODUCED BY COMPUTER.	MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY, TRANSCRIPT

1 (CALL TO ORDER OF THE COURT AT 1:45 P.M.) 2 THE COURT: GOOD AFTERNOON. 3 ATTORNEYS: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR. 4 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MS. HOPSON, WOULD YOU 5 CALL THIS CASE, PLEASE. 6 THE CLERK: USA VERSUS XIAORONG YOU, CASE 7 NUMBER CR-2-19-14. 8 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. OF COURSE, MR. SHIPLEY 9 AND MR. HARKER ARE PRESENT HERE IN THE COURTROOM. IS THAT THE U.S. ATTORNEY? IT IS. 10 11 MR. OVERBEY: YES, IT IS, YOUR HONOR. GOOD 12 AFTERNOON. THE COURT: GOOD AFTERNOON. 13 14 THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, MR. OVERBEY, HAS 15 JOINED US BY VIDEO. WE HAVE A COUPLE OF LAWYERS FOR THE 16 GOVERNMENT ON THE TELEPHONE. 17 ALL RIGHT. COUNSEL, WE'LL TRY TO MOVE THROUGH THIS AS QUICKLY AS WE CAN. I HAVE TRIED NOT TO SCHEDULE 18 19 HEARINGS DURING THIS PERIOD OF TIME, BUT THIS ONE SEEMED 2.0 TO BE ONE WE COULDN'T AVOID A HEARING ON. THERE ARE TWO 21 MATTERS, OF COURSE, PENDING BEFORE THE COURT. THE FIRST 2.2 ONE IS A STATUS CONFERENCE, BASICALLY A SCHEDULING 23 CONFERENCE TO TALK ABOUT THE RESCHEDULING OF THIS CANCELED 24 TRIAL; AND, SECONDLY, TO REVISIT THE MOTION FOR BOND THAT

WAS PREVIOUSLY FILED BY, BY THE DEFENDANT. I SHOULD ALSO

25

NOTE THAT THE DEFENDANT IS PRESENT BY VIDEO AS WELL.

MS. YOU, CAN YOU HEAR US OKAY?

2.0

2.2

THE DEFENDANT: YES. YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: OKAY. GOOD. IF AT ANY TIME YOU HAVE TROUBLE HEARING, LET ME KNOW, PLEASE.

THE DEFENDANT: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. COUNSEL, UNLESS THERE'S SOME REASON TO DO IT IN A DIFFERENT ORDER, I SUGGEST WE TAKE UP THE BOND MOTION FIRST AND THEN DEAL WITH THE SCHEDULING ISSUE, ALL RIGHT.

MR. SHIPLEY, I TAKE IT YOU'RE GOING TO ADDRESS THAT ISSUE. WHY DON'T YOU, SO THAT WE CAN MAINTAIN AS MUCH SEPARATION AS POSSIBLE, JUST REMAIN SEATED AND SPEAK INTO THAT MICROPHONE THERE, AND THEN MR. HARKER CAN DO THE SAME.

MR. SHIPLEY: VERY WELL, JUDGE.

THE COURT: AND, MR. SHIPLEY, I'LL JUST JUMP
RIGHT IN BEFORE YOU START. LET ME TELL YOU WHAT MY
CONCERN AT THIS POINT IS. AS THE RECORD REFLECTS, THE
COURT ENTERED AN ORDER INITIALLY GRANTING THE DEFENDANT'S
MOTION FOR BOND IN THIS CASE, BUT BECAUSE OF SOME CONCERNS
THAT AROSE BASED ON INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM THE
PROBATION OFFICE I WAS MORE CONCERNED THAT THERE HAD BEEN
SOME MISINFORMATION, HOPEFULLY NOT MISREPRESENTATIONS,
PROVIDED TO THE COURT IN THOSE PLEADINGS, SPECIFICALLY

WITH RESPECT TO THE POSSIBILITY OF THE DEFENDANT'S HUSBAND BEING A THIRD-PARTY CUSTODIAN AND THE REPRESENTATION TO THE COURT THAT MS. YOU WOULD LIVE IN PROPERTY OWNED BY HER IN JOHNSON CITY.

2.2

I HAVE SEEN YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL PLEADING, I'VE
READ ALL THE PLEADINGS, BUT I'LL BE HAPPY TO HEAR FROM
YOU, BUT MY CONCERN, FRANKLY, IS WITH, WITH THOSE ISSUES.

MR. SHIPLEY: YOUR HONOR, FIRST AND FOREMOST
THAT'S WHY I DECIDED TO FILE THE SUPPLEMENTAL PLEADING
YESTERDAY BECAUSE, FIRST AND FOREMOST, JUDGE, THERE WAS
NEVER ANY, ANY INTENT. I HAVE TALKED WITH THE UNITED
STATES PROBATION OFFICE ABOUT ANY POSSIBLE MISINFORMATION
OR MISREPRESENTATION, JUDGE, THAT WAS NEVER, NEVER MY
INTENT, NEVER MR. JESSEE'S INTENT TO DO SO.

JUDGE, AS YOU KNOW VERY WELL, WE'RE OPERATING ON CHANGING CIRCUMSTANCES EVERYDAY. WE WERE UNDER THE UNDERSTANDING THAT AT THE TIME WE FILED OUR ORIGINAL MOTION FOR RELEASE, PRETRIAL RELEASE, I SHOULD SAY,

THAT -- WELL, I SHOULD SAY THIS, THAT HER HUSBAND, MR. SU {PH}, WE WEREN'T, WE WEREN'T SURE AT THAT TIME WHAT HIS JOB SITUATION WAS GOING TO BE. WE THINK NOW BASED ON WHAT WE KNOW THAT HE IS GOING TO BE AN ESSENTIAL EMPLOYEE.

HE'S GOING TO GET TO KEEP HIS JOB. THAT IS REFLECTED IN THE SUPPLEMENT, JUDGE. SOUTH CAROLINA FINALLY FOLLOWED SUIT ON APRIL THE 6TH AND ISSUED THE STAY-AT-HOME ORDER.

THAT PROVIDES THE, THE ISSUE WHY, WHY WE, OR WHY I

DISCUSSED THAT WITH THE PROBATION OFFICE ABOUT A POSSIBLE

ALTERNATIVE.

2.0

2.2

JUDGE, IT WAS NEVER INTENDED FROM THE DEFENSE SIDE, WHEN MR. JESSEE AND I SAT IN MY OFFICE AND TALKED TO THE PROBATION OFFICE, THAT THIS WAS THE ONLY OPTION THAT WAS THERE. QUITE THE CONTRARY, JUDGE. WE WERE OPERATING UNDER THE ASSUMPTION THAT WE HAD THE HEARING SCHEDULED WITH JUDGE WYRICK AND JUDGE WYRICK WAS GOING TO SET THOSE CONDITIONS OF BOND, SET THOSE CONDITIONS OF RELEASE. IT WAS JUST A SUGGESTION THAT SHE COULD RESIDE IN ANDERSON, SOUTH CAROLINA AND BE SUBJECTED TO THE SAME BOND CONDITIONS.

JUDGE, AS I'VE NOTATED IN MY SUPPLEMENT THAT
WAS ONE OF THE OPTIONS THAT I SAY THAT, YOU KNOW, WITH THE
PROPER CONDITIONS I BELIEVE THAT SHE COULD BE -- THAT HER
HUSBAND COULD ACT AS A THIRD-PARTY CUSTODIAN WITH THE
PROPER HOME CONFINEMENT, ELECTRONIC MONITORING AS WE HAVE
SEEN IN THE PAPERWORK HERE THAT WAS JUST PROVIDED TO US,
EVEN THOUGH THERE IS A DISTANCE ISSUE, I UNDERSTAND THAT,
JUDGE. WE'VE GOT 142 MILES FROM WHERE WE SIT RIGHT NOW TO
WHERE HER HOME IS, BUT THAT WOULD --

THE COURT: LET ME GO AHEAD AND ADDRESS THAT AS WELL, MR. SHIPLEY. I'M NOT LIKELY TO APPROVE HER LIVING IN ANDERSON, SOUTH CAROLINA. AS YOU NOTED IN YOUR PLEA,

IT'S 142 MILES FROM GREENEVILLE. IT -- ALTHOUGH I HAVE FOUND THAT THE RISK OF FLIGHT HAS BEEN TEMPERED SOMEWHAT HERE BY THE CIRCUMSTANCES, I THINK THERE IS STILL SOME CONCERN ABOUT RISK OF FLIGHT; AND I, I GUESS I'D REPEAT WHAT I SAID TO THE PROBATION OFFICER EARLIER, I'M NOT INCLINED TO GIVE HER A THREE HOUR HEAD START.

2.0

2.2

MR. SHIPLEY: VERY WELL, JUDGE, AND THAT WOULD TAKE ME TO MY SECOND OPTION, JUDGE, THAT I WOULD PRESENT TO THE COURT.

THERE WAS SOME INFORMATION, AND I'M, I'M

GETTING THIS INFORMATION, JUDGE, FROM MS., DR. -- FROM

DR. YOU'S HUSBAND THAT I'M GETTING INFORMATION TO FROM

WHAT THEIR CONVERSATIONS WERE, PROBATION, MEANING THEIR

CONVERSATIONS WITH DR. YOU'S HUSBAND, SO I'M GETTING, YOU

KNOW, TWO DIFFERENT VERSIONS -- OR I DON'T MEAN TWO

DIFFERENT VERSIONS, BUT TWO VERSIONS, I SHOULD SAY, OF

KIND OF WHAT'S GOING ON.

ALTERNATIVELY, JUDGE, IN MY SUPPLEMENT I
SUGGESTED THAT SHE LIVE IN WASHINGTON COUNTY. I REREAD
OUR MOTION THIS MORNING, AND SAYING THAT, JUDGE, I BELIEVE
WE SAID IN OUR MOTION THAT SHE OWNS PROPERTY IN WASHINGTON
COUNTY AND SHE CAN LIVE THERE. SHE DOES IN FACT HAVE A
TOWNHOUSE OR A CONDO IN WASHINGTON COUNTY. THE TENANTS
ARE THERE, THEY HAVE A LEASE THROUGH I BELIEVE IT'S
NOVEMBER OF 2020. MR. JESSEE CONFIRMED WITHIN THE LAST

COUPLE OF DAYS THROUGH HER, THROUGH DR. YOU'S HUSBAND THAT

IF THE COURT WERE TO REQUIRE THAT PLACE BE THE SPECIFIC

LOCATION WHERE SHE IS TO RESIDE, THAT THERE IS A POSSI
BILITY THE TENANTS CAN MOVE OUT AND SEEK OTHER RESIDENCE.

2.0

2.2

THE COURT: WELL, I'M NOT SURE IT'S HELPFUL TO TALK IN TERMS OF POSSIBILITIES AT THIS POINT.

MR. SHIPLEY: SECONDLY, JUDGE, IF THE COURT

DOESN'T -- THAT'S JUST AN OPTION, BUT, ALTERNATIVELY,

JUDGE, THERE IS A SET OF APARTMENTS THAT I'M SURE THE

COURT IS VERY FAMILIAR WITH THAT'S LITERALLY .5 MILES AWAY

FROM THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, IT'S CALLED THE

HAVEN AT KNOB CREEK.

JUDGE, WE, WE CONFIRMED RECENTLY, AND THAT HAS BEEN CONFIRMED VIA E-MAIL, THAT THIS APARTMENT COMPLEX LOCATED AT 1185 WEST MOUNTAIN VIEW ROAD, JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE, AND, LIKE I SAID, THAT IT'S WITHIN .5 MILES OF DRIVING FROM THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION OFF KNOB CREEK ROAD, THEY DO HAVE LODGING, AND THEY ARE WILLING TO ACCEPT DR. YOU TO BE A PLACE OF POSSIBLE RESIDENCE.

JUDGE, I THINK THAT BEING, BEING THE LOCATION

IT IS, THAT WOULD ALLEVIATE THE COURT'S CONCERN ABOUT IT

BEING IN EAST TENNESSEE. IT ALSO PUTS HER IN A POSITION

THAT SHE IS IN, IF SHE IS CONFINED, WHICH I'M ASSUMING SHE

WILL BE IF THE COURT SO CHOOSES TO RELEASE HER TO BE AT

HOME, HOUSE ARREST, IF YOU WILL, THAT WOULD ALLOW HER EASY

ACCESS TO THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION IF WE HAVE
TO GO LOOK AT -- IF WE HAVE TO GO VIEW EVIDENCE THERE OR
JUST IN THE LOCALE BEING THAT CLOSE TO THE FEDERAL BUREAU
OF INVESTIGATION. JUDGE, THAT IS MORE FOR SURE, AND I
CAN, AND I CAN PROVIDE THAT CONFIRMATION, JUDGE, THAT
THERE IS ACTUAL LODGING FOR HER TO HAVE THERE. THAT TAKES
UP THE CONCERN OF SPECULATING WHETHER OR NOT THE TENANTS
THAT ARE THERE UNDER CONTRACT RIGHT NOW TO BE THERE UNTIL
NOVEMBER 2020 TO VACATE.

THIRD, JUDGE, MY --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

THE COURT: MR. SHIPLEY, THAT GOES RIGHT TO THE HEART OF MY CONCERN ABOUT THE REPRESENTATIONS THAT WERE MADE TO THE COURT. WHETHER YOU KNEW AT THE TIME YOU FILED THE PLEADING OR NOT THAT THAT PROPERTY WAS LEASED, YOU CLEARLY WERE PUT ON NOTICE OF IT BY THE TIME THE GOVERN-MENT'S RESPONSE WAS FILED. MR. HARKER NOTED THE FACT THAT THAT PROPERTY WAS UNDER LEASE IN A FOOTNOTE IN HIS PLEADING, AND, YET, I HEARD NOTHING FURTHER AND ONLY LEARNED FROM THE PROBATION OFFICE JUST BEFORE JUDGE WYRICK'S HEARING THAT THAT IN FACT WAS PROPERTY THAT WAS NOT AVAILABLE TO HER. THAT -- I'M NOT SURE HOW THAT MISUNDERSTANDING ARISES; BUT I TAKE IT AT THIS POINT THAT YOU ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE PROPERTY SHE OWNS IN WASHINGTON COUNTY IS NOT CURRENTLY AVAILABLE FOR HER TO RESIDE THERE BECAUSE IT IS LEASED TO THIRD PARTIES?

MR. SHIPLEY: JUDGE, THE SHORT ANSWER TO THAT
QUESTION IS I ACKNOWLEDGE THAT IT IS LEASED, AND I NEVER
INTENDED TO, IN ANY PLEADING THAT WE FILED WITH THE COURT
TO COME ACROSS AND SAY THAT, TRYING TO HIDE THAT FROM THE
COURT, SAYING THAT IT NOT AVAILABLE. MY UNDERSTANDING,
JUDGE, IS THAT AT ANY TIME, BASED ON WHAT I HAVE BEEN TOLD
BY DR. YOU'S HUSBAND, THAT IT CAN -- THAT THE PARTIES
THERE ARE -- THERE ARE OPTIONS, JUDGE, FOR THAT PARTY
THERE TO VACATE THE PREMISES AND SEEK OTHER, OTHER
RESIDENCES, JUDGE, LIKE AND, AND -THE COURT: IS THERE A PROVISION IN THE LEASE

2.0

2.2

THAT ALLOWS THE RIGHT FOR YOU TO SIMPLY CANCEL THAT LEASE?

MR. SHIPLEY: JUDGE, AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED, I

DON'T KNOW THAT THERE IS A UNILATERAL PROVISION IN THAT

LEASE THAT WOULD ALLOW HER TO CANCEL THAT LEASE, I'VE JUST

BEEN TOLD THAT THAT'S A POSSIBILITY, JUDGE; AND I UNDER
STAND WHERE THE COURT IS COMING FROM, BUT IN OUR INITIAL

MOTION THE WAY IT WAS WRITTEN WHEN IT SAYS THAT SHE OWNS

PROPERTY IN WASHINGTON COUNTY AND CAN RESIDE THERE, IT'S,

IT WAS ALWAYS A POSSIBILITY, JUDGE, FOR HER TO RESIDE

THERE AT THAT PLACE, BUT ALSO TO RESIDE IN WASHINGTON

COUNTY. WE THOUGHT THAT'S SOMETHING THAT THE COURT WOULD

REQUIRE HER TO DO. WE CAN ABSOLUTELY FIND PROPER

ACCOMMODATIONS.

OTHERWISE, JUDGE, WE HAVE, WE HAVE ALSO IN-

QUIRED SINCE, SINCE THIS HAS BEEN GOING ON, WE'VE INQUIRED THROUGH MULTIPLE -- WELL, NOT MULTIPLE, BUT A SINGLE REALTOR IN THE WASHINGTON COUNTY AREA THAT BASICALLY SHOWED US THAT THERE ARE OTHER ACCOMMODATIONS, AND MR. JESSEE AND I HAVE FOLLOWED UP ON THAT AND CONFIRMED THAT A PLACE WITHIN A HALF A MILE OF THE FBI IS IN FACT AVAILABLE. SO, JUDGE, IT WAS NEVER --

THE COURT: WHICH ONE OF THOSE COMPLEXES ON

KNOB CREEK IS THE HAVEN? THERE -- I CAN THINK OF RIGHT

NOW AT LEAST THREE OF THOSE COMPLEXES RIGHT THERE ON KNOB

CREEK ROAD.

MR. SHIPLEY: JUDGE, IF I'M NOT MISTAKEN -THE COURT: IS THAT THE GATED COMMUNITY OR -MR. SHIPLEY: I THINK SO, JUDGE.

MR. JESSEE: YES.

2.0

2.2

MR. SHIPLEY: THE REASON I SAY THAT IS, I THINK IT IS, AND MR. JESSEE, I KNOW HE'S TALKED TO ME ABOUT THAT, HE CAN PROBABLY SPEAK TO THAT BECAUSE I THINK HE'S VERY FAMILIAR WITH THE HAVEN; BUT I THINK, JUDGE, THAT IS THE -- IF YOU'RE TRAVELING TO JOHNSON CITY AND YOU TAKE THE BACK ROAD ON KNOB -- IF YOU TAKE KNOB CREEK ROAD INSTEAD OF TAKING -- YOU WOULD TAKE A LEFT ONTO MOUNTAIN VIEW IS THE APARTMENT, IT'S THE CORPORATE QUARTERS, AND I THINK THAT'S WHAT THEY SPECIALIZE IN IS FOR PEOPLE THAT ARE COMING THERE TO STAY. THEY'RE FULLY FURNISHED

APARTMENTS, AND THAT'S WHERE WE HAVE CONFIRMED THAT THERE
IS ACTUALLY A PLACE FOR HER TO STAY.

2.0

2.2

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THAT DOESN'T -MR. JESSEE, YOU MIGHT WANT TO JUMP IN. THAT DOESN'T SOUND
LIKE THE GATED COMMUNITY, THAT SOUNDS MORE LIKE THE ONE
RIGHT THERE BEHIND THE OLD SHOPPING CENTER.

MR. JESSEE: YOUR HONOR, IT IS THE HAVEN, IT IS THE ONE YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT, IT IS THE GATED COMMUNITY.

THE COURT: IT IS THE GATED COMMUNITY.

MR. JESSEE: CORPORATE QUARTERS OF KNOXVILLE
LEASES PERMANENTLY 20 OF THOSE FACILITIES. I HAPPEN TO
HAVE LIVED IN ONE FOR SIX MONTHS ABOUT SIX YEARS AGO. I
CONFIRMED WITH THEM, THEY'RE HOLDING A ONE BEDROOM. THEY
CONTROL THOSE UNITS, BUT IT IS IN THE HAVEN, WHICH IS
THOSE MULTI-COLORED SECTIONS WITH THE GATE RIGHT THERE, ON
MOUNTAIN VIEW ROAD YOU'D COME DOWN TO THE CORNER AND YOU
EITHER GO UNDER THE OVERPASS IF YOU GO STRAIGHT OR THE
RAILROAD OR YOU TURN LEFT AND GO DOWN TO THE FBI OFFICE.
THE, THE UNIT IS AVAILABLE NOW. I TALKED TO THEM AGAIN
THIS MORNING. IT'S FULLY FURNISHED. SHE ONLY HAS TO SHOW
UP WITH HER CLOTHES AND TOILETRIES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. JESSEE: AND I JUST AT RANDOM ASKED THEM WOULD THEY BE AVAILABLE FOR AT LEAST FOUR TO SIX MONTHS DEPENDING ON WHEN YOUR HONOR WAS GOING TO SET THE TRIAL,

1 AND THEY SAID IT WAS, AND WE JUST HAVE TO GIVE THEM NOTICE 2 TO CLEAN TO MOVE IN. 3

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

ALL RIGHT. MR. SHIPLEY, ANYTHING ELSE ON THAT ISSUE THEN?

AND, BY THE WAY, I JUST PULLED UP YOUR MOTION. HERE'S WHAT IT SAYS, IT SAYS, "DR. YOU HAS PROPERTY IN WASHINGTON COUNTY, TENNESSEE WHERE SHE WOULD STAY IN THE EVENT OF HER RELEASE." THAT'S A LITTLE DIFFERENT THAN SAYING THAT SHE CAN STAY THERE OR SHE MIGHT STAY THERE OR SHE COULD STAY THERE, IT SAYS THAT IS WHERE SHE WOULD STAY. THAT WAS MY CONCERN. AND THAT WAS NEVER CORRECTED AFTER THE FILING OF THE GOVERNMENT'S PLEADING, NOR IN FACT WAS IT CORRECTED UNTIL YESTERDAY IN THE RECORD.

MR. SHIPLEY: JUDGE, I'M --

THE COURT: AND THE VERY NEXT SENTENCE INDICATES THAT DR. YOU'S HUSBAND IS CURRENTLY EMPLOYED IN GREENEVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA AND COULD STAY WITH HER IN THE EVENT OF HER RELEASE. THAT DOES NOT APPEAR TO HAVE NECES-SARILY BEEN THE CASE EITHER, ALTHOUGH I'LL ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE STAY-AT-HOME ORDER WAS NOT ENTERED IN SOUTH CAROLINA UNTIL JUST A FEW DAYS AGO.

MR. JESSEE: YOUR HONOR, NOT TO INTERRUPT --

THE COURT: THAT'S WHAT I SEE AS TROUBLING.

MR. JESSEE: YOUR HONOR --

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

THE COURT: GO AHEAD, MR. JESSEE.

MR. JESSEE: -- NOT TO INTERRUPT, IT IS HER HUSBAND'S INTENTION, HAVING TALKED TO HIM, THAT IF HE HAS TO PHYSICALLY STAY WITH HER, HE HAD -- IT'S A TWO-HOUR DRIVE TO HIS OFFICE IN SOUTH CAROLINA, HE WOULD JUST HAVE TO MAKE THE DRIVE EVERYDAY AND RETURN, AND HE UNDERSTANDS THAT.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

ALL RIGHT. ANYTHING ELSE ON THE MOTION?

MR. SHIPLEY: AND, JUDGE, JUST AGAIN ON THE RECORD, THAT'S WHY THAT WE MADE SURE TO FILE THE SUPPLEMENT YESTERDAY. AGAIN, IT WAS NEVER ANY INTENT TO MISLEAD THE COURT, MISLEAD THE PROBATION OFFICE. IT WAS FROM THE TIME, I THINK ON MARCH THE 27TH, JUDGE -- AND I APOLOGIZE, I'M LOOKING AT THE COURT'S ORDER HERE, ORDER ON RELEASE WAS MARCH THE 25TH, AND I SPOKE TO PROBATION, AND MR. JESSEE AND I IN MY OFFICE SPOKE TO PROBATION ON MARCH THE 27TH, AND THAT'S JUST WHERE WE WERE SUGGESTING THAT THERE COULD BE ALTERNATIVES, AND IT WAS NEVER A -- I DON'T KNOW HOW TO SAY IT, JUDGE, OTHER THAN IT WAS NEVER -- TO US IT WAS SOMETHING THAT WE WERE TRYING TO PROVIDE OPTIONS TO WHERE SHE COULD STAY, AND IT WAS NEVER INTENDED TO --AND I THOUGHT THAT WAS SOMETHING, JUDGE, BASED ON PROBATION'S REPRESENTATIONS TO THE COURT SUBSEQUENTLY, IF THAT'S SOMETHING THAT DIDN'T WORK, WE COULD GO FROM THERE;

BUT, JUDGE, THERE WAS NEVER ANY INTENT IN HERE TO MISLEAD THE COURT, AND THAT'S WHY I FELT IT NECESSARY YESTERDAY BEFORE WE GOT IN HERE BASED ON THE COURT'S MOST RECENT ORDER REGARDING THE MISREPRESENTATIONS OR THE POTENTIAL MISREPRESENTATIONS. IT WAS NEVER AN INTENTIONAL MISREPRESENTATION. NOW, WAS IT A MISTAKE? WAS IT WORDED IMPROPERLY? YES, JUDGE, AND I'LL ACKNOWLEDGE THAT IT WAS WORDED IMPROPERLY, BUT IT WAS NEVER ANY TYPE OF INTENTIONAL, INTENTIONAL ACT TO MISLEAD THE COURT OR PROBATION BECAUSE FINDING A SUITABLE RESIDENCE FOR HER, FOR DR. YOU, PENDING HER POTENTIAL RELEASE, I'M ASSUMING WOULD BE SOMETHING THAT PROBATION WOULD HAVE TO SAY THIS IS ACCEPTABLE AND THIS WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE TO JUDGE WYRICK AND ALSO ULTIMATELY ACCEPTABLE TO YOU, YOUR HONOR, SO. JUST, JUST FOR THAT, JUDGE, THAT'S, JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT'S WHY WE FILED WHAT WE WANTED TO FILE, AND WHEN WE KNEW SOMETHING DEFINITIVELY TO FILE, INSTEAD OF MAKING MULTIPLE FILINGS, THAT'S WHAT WE DECIDED TO DO YESTERDAY, JUDGE. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ONE OTHER QUESTION BEFORE I HEAR FROM MR. HARKER. MR. SHIPLEY, MR. JESSEE, ARE THERE ANY OF THE CONDITIONS PROPOSED BY THE GOVERNMENT THAT YOU WOULD RESIST? MR. SHIPLEY: JUDGE, I'LL GO AHEAD AND SPEAK TO

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

THAT, AND NOT TO JUMP IN FRONT OF MR. JESSEE, AND -- BUT

IT KIND OF GOES BACK TO MY, WITHIN MY SUPPLEMENT, JUDGE,
TO THE THIRD OPTION. JUDGE, WE'RE NOT HERE IN A POSITION
TO REALLY ARGUE WITH ANY TYPE OF CONDITION THAT WOULD BE
SET BY THE COURT. AS I SAID, JUDGE, AS THE THIRD OPTION
IN THE SUPPLEMENT, IF THE COURT REQUIRED HER TO STAY IN
GREENEVILLE, TENNESSEE WITHIN ROCK-THROWING DISTANCE OF
THE COURT, THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WE WOULD TRY TO MAKE
HAPPEN AND DO IT EXPEDITIOUSLY, JUDGE.

2.2

SO AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED, AND I'LL DEFER TO MR. JESSEE TO MAKE A SUPPLEMENT TO WHAT I'M SAYING, BUT I DON'T THINK WE HAVE ANY OBJECTION TO WHATEVER CONDITIONS THAT THE COURT WANTS TO PUT ON DR. YOU BECAUSE AS LONG AS SHE IS COMMUNICATING TO THE UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICE, IF SHE HAS TO -- IF SHE IS TRAVELING TO MY OFFICE OR IF SHE IS TRAVELING TO MR. JESSEE'S OFFICE IN JOHNSON CITY, THAT'S THE ONLY PLACE THAT SHE'LL BE GOING. SO, JUDGE, AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED WE DON'T HAVE ANY OBJECTIONS TO ANY TYPE OF RESTRICTIVE OR TO THE UTMOST RESTRICTIVE CONDITIONS THAT THE COURT WOULD SET.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

ALL RIGHT. THEN, MR. HARKER, I'LL HEAR FROM
YOU ON THIS AS WELL. KEEP IN MIND THAT I HAVE READ YOUR
PLEADINGS AND YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL PLEADINGS, AND I GUESS I'D
LIKE FOR YOU TO ADDRESS ONE QUESTION FOR ME AT THE BEGINNING. I'VE SEEN THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S MEMO OF APRIL 6,

THE U.S. ATTORNEY'S, IN WHICH HE INDICATES THAT THE CONCERN ABOUT COVID-19 IS, IN THE DEPARTMENT'S VIEW, NOW A SIGNIFICANT FACTOR IN BOND DECISIONS. I WOULD LIKE FOR YOU TO TELL ME IN LIGHT OF THAT DIRECTIVE FROM THE ATTORNEY GENERAL WHETHER YOUR POSITION HAS CHANGED ANY.

2.0

2.2

MR. HARKER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

AND I HAVE READ THAT DIRECTIVE, AND THE

GOVERNMENT'S POSITION HAS NOT CHANGED IN THIS PARTICULAR

CASE. AND IN THAT DIRECTIVE ONE OF THE FACTORS THAT THE

GOVERNMENT IS STILL TO CONSIDER IS FLIGHT RISK, AND THE

GOVERNMENT'S POSITION IS THAT TODAY VERSUS A YEAR AGO IT'S

NOT THE CASE THAT THE RISK OF FLIGHT HAS BEEN MITIGATED,

IT'S ACTUALLY THE CASE THAT THE RISK OF FLIGHT HAS

INCREASED; AND SO I'D LIKE TO ADDRESS A FEW -- I'D LIKE TO

PROVIDE THE COURT WITH A FEW EXPLANATIONS AS TO WHY, BUT

I'D ALSO LIKE TO DIGRESS BRIEFLY TO ADDRESS THE

CORONAVIRUS CONCERN.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. HARKER: AND IF I MAY, I NOTE -- I NOTE

THAT THE DEFENSE -- WHERE SHOULD THE COURT LOOK TO

DETERMINE WHAT TYPES OF CONCERNS IT HAS ABOUT THE

CORONAVIRUS, IN PARTICULAR AT THE WASHINGTON COUNTY

DETENTION CENTER; AND I'LL NOTE THAT THE DEFENSE MOTION IS

THE FIRST PLACE TO LOOK, AND THEY DON'T ACTUALLY MAKE AN

ARGUMENT THAT THE DEFENDANT IS SUSCEPTIBLE TO THIS ILLNESS

MORE THAN ANY ORDINARY PERSON, THAT SHE HAS ANY PARTICULAR MEDICAL CONDITION THAT WOULD CAUSE HER TO BE AT A HEIGHTENED RISK, SHE IS NOT ELDERLY. AND AS OF EARLIER THIS WEEK, I CONFIRMED WITH A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE WASHINGTON COUNTY DETENTION CENTER, THE REGIONAL DIRECTOR OF NURSING, THAT THERE ARE AS OF EARLIER THIS WEEK NO CASES OF THE CORONAVIRUS AT THE WASHINGTON COUNTY DETENTION CENTER.

2.0

2.2

ON TOP OF THAT I CONFIRMED WITH MS. HEATHER
TAYLOR, WHO IS THE REGIONAL DIRECTOR OF NURSING FOR
QUALITY CORRECTIONAL HEALTH CARE, THAT THERE IS IN FACT IN
PLACE THERE A WELL ARTICULATED PLAN AS TO EXACTLY WHAT THE
MEDICAL STAFF THERE WILL DO IN THE EVENT OF A CORONAVIRUS
INFECTION; AND I CAN PROVIDE FOR THE COURT MS. TAYLOR'S
E-MAIL TO ME WITH THE ATTACHMENTS IF THE COURT WOULD LIKE
TO SEE THAT. THE POINT IS AT THIS MOMENT WASHINGTON
COUNTY IS EXTREMELY WELL PREPARED, PERHAPS BETTER PREPARED
THAN SOME OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITIES INTO WHICH THE DEFENDANT WOULD BE RELEASED TO HANDLE A CORONAVIRUS.

THE COURT: YOU'RE SUGGESTING THAT THE RISK OF CONTRACTING THE VIRUS IS LESS IN THE JAIL THAN IT IS IN THE COMMUNITY?

MR. HARKER: NO, YOUR HONOR, I'M NOT QUALIFIED TO MAKE THAT SORT OF STATEMENT. WHAT I AM SAYING RIGHT NOW IS THE DEFENSE HAS NOT ARGUED THAT THE DEFENDANT IS

LIKELY TO BE INFECTED. THERE'S NO EVIDENCE THAT SHE'S
LIKELY TO BE INFECTED IN THE JAIL, AND --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

THE COURT: BUT DOESN'T COMMON SENSE TELL US

THAT CONFINING A PERSON UNDER THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES WITH

HUNDREDS OF OTHER PEOPLE WHO HAVE CERTAINLY THE POTENTIAL

OF SPREADING THE DISEASE IS GREATER THAN WOULD BE IN THE

COMMUNITY?

MR. HARKER: WELL, YOUR HONOR, I COULD READ TO YOU WHAT -- I RAISED THOSE EXACT CONCERNS WITH MS. TAYLOR, AND I CAN READ TO THE COURT WHAT SHE SAID IN PART IN RESPONSE; BUT TO SUMMARIZE THOSE POINTS, THEY SCREEN EVERY VISITOR, THEY TAKE TEMPERATURES. IF A PERSON WERE TO TEST POSITIVE, THEY PLACE THAT PERSON IN ISOLATION FOR AS LONG AS NECESSARY, IN EFFECT IN QUARANTINE. I WOULD SUBMIT THAT IN SOME CASES THE PRISON MIGHT ACTUALLY BE BETTER AT QUARANTINING A PERSON THAN AT ANOTHER PLACE, BUT I'M NOT SUGGESTING THAT THE RISK OF INFECTION IS GREATER OR LESS; AND I UNDERSTAND THE ANECDOTAL SENSE THAT IT IS MORE LIKELY THAT YOU MIGHT BE INFECTED, BUT THE QUESTION BEFORE THE COURT IS IS THE DEFENDANT A RISK OF NONAPPEARANCE, NOT WHETHER OR NOT SHE'S LIKELY TO BE INFECTED; AND I ADMIT THAT IF THE FACTORS WERE TO CHANGE, IF THERE WERE AN OUTBREAK OF THIS ILLNESS WITHIN WASHINGTON COUNTY, THEN PERHAPS THE ISSUE WOULD HAVE TO BE REVISITED.

THE COURT: BUT MAYBE YOU AND I ARE READING THE

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S MEMO DIFFERENTLY. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT WHAT HE IS DIRECTING THAT YOU CONSIDER IS THE RISK OF CONTRACTING THE DISEASE, NOT THE RISK OF DYING FROM IT.

MR. HARKER: YES, SIR.

2.0

2.2

THE COURT: AND THE RISK DOESN'T NECESSARILY

CORRELATE TO THE MINUTE-BY-MINUTE CONDITIONS WITHIN THE

JAIL. IN OTHER WORDS, THE RISK HAS NOTHING TO DO AT THIS

POINT WITH WHETHER THERE HAVE OR HAVE NOT BEEN CASES. IF

THERE HAVE BEEN CASES, I WOULD ASSUME THERE IS A

HEIGHTENED RISK. NEVERTHELESS, THE RISK OF AN INMATE

CONTRACTING THE VIRUS IS, IS PRESENT IN A JAIL, CERTAINLY,

WOULDN'T YOU AGREE WITH THAT?

MR. HARKER: YES, YOUR HONOR, JUST LIKE IT'S PRESENT IN THE POPULATION; AND IT MAY IN FACT BE HIGHER, AND WE ARE CONSIDERING THAT.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. OKAY.

MR. HARKER: AND I WOULD ADD, YOUR HONOR, THAT ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THAT, LET'S ASSUME FOR THE SAKE OF ARGUMENT THAT OTHER THAN THE CORONAVIRUS ALL OTHER THINGS ARE EQUAL OR AT LEAST UNCHANGED FROM WHERE THEY WERE A YEAR AGO, I THINK THE GOVERNMENT WOULD ADD TO THIS POINT, THERE ARE SEVERAL FACTORS THAT ARE ALSO WEIGHING IN FAVOR OF A HIGHER RISK OF FLIGHT. ONE IS THAT THE REPRESENTATIONS IN THE DEFENSE FILING, EVEN THOUGH THE DEFENSE COUNSEL THEMSELVES UNDERSTOOD THAT THOSE REPRESENTATIONS

WERE TRUE AT THE TIME THEY MADE THEM, THE DEFENDANT AND THE DEFENDANT'S HUSBAND KNEW THAT THEY WERE NOT TRUE. THE DEFENDANT KNEW THAT HER PROPERTY WAS LEASED THROUGH NOVEMBER 2020; AND THE GOVERNMENT ALSO HAS A COPY OF THAT LEASE AGREEMENT HERE IF THE COURT WOULD LIKE TO ACOUIRE A COPY OF THAT. IN ADDITION, HER HUSBAND KNEW THAT HE WAS UNLIKELY TO BE ABLE TO TRAVEL FROM EAST TENNESSEE TO HIS JOB IN SOUTH CAROLINA WHETHER OR NOT A STAY-AT-HOME ORDER WAS IN PLACE. HE AND SHE BOTH KNEW THAT THOSE THINGS WERE FALSE AT THE TIME THAT THEIR REPRESENTATIVES, COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENDANT, FILED THE MOTION. IN OTHER WORDS, THE DEFENDANT WAS WILLING TO CAUSE FALSE STATEMENTS TO BE MADE TO THIS COURT TO INDUCE THIS COURT TO RELEASE THE DEFENDANT.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

AND THEN FURTHER I WOULD POINT OUT, I'VE OF
COURSE READ THE COURT'S ORDER THAT TALKS ABOUT THE RISK OF
FLIGHT TO CHINA, AND LET'S CONCEDE, LET THE GOVERNMENT
CONCEDE FOR THE SAKE OF ARGUMENT THAT THE RISK OF FLIGHT
TO CHINA TODAY IS LOWER THAN IT WAS SAY FOUR MONTHS AGO,
IT WOULD BE HARDER TO GET DIRECTLY TO CHINA, BUT THE
QUESTION UNDER 3162 IS WHETHER OR NOT THERE'S A RISK OF
NONAPPEARANCE. THE DEFENDANT DOESN'T NEED TO BE IN CHINA
IN ORDER TO BE A FUGITIVE, SHE COULD HIDE IN THE WOODS OF
NORTH CAROLINA, THAT WOULD BE SUFFICIENT, AT LEAST FOR THE
TIME BEING.

1 ALSO IN PREPARATION FOR THIS HEARING, YOUR 2 HONOR, I USED PUBLIC WEBSITES TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT A FLIGHT COULD BE OBTAINED FROM QUEBEC AND MEXICO CITY, IN 3 4 FACT, AN FBI AGENT DID THIS ON MY BEHALF, AND FLIGHTS ARE 5 AVAILABLE IN THE NEAR FUTURE FROM MEXICO CITY AND OUEBEC 6 TO CHINA. NOW, I DON'T KNOW WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE PEOPLE 7 LAND ON A TARMAC IN BEIJING, I DON'T KNOW WHETHER OR NOT 8 THE CHINESE AUTHORITIES WOULD LET ANY PARTICULAR PASSENGER 9 IN, BUT I SUSPECT THEY WOULD LET THIS PARTICULAR PASSENGER 10 IN. SO THE GOVERNMENT'S POSITION IS THE DEFENDANT IS AN 11 EXTRAORDINARY FLIGHT RISK, EVEN IF THAT RISK IS SOMEWHAT MITIGATED BY THE INCREASED DIFFICULTY OF FINDING A PLANE 12 13 TICKET TO CHINA, IT DOESN'T MEAN THAT SHE'S STILL NOT A 14 HIGH FLIGHT RISK, AND WE THINK THAT THAT RISK OFFSETS THE 15 RISK, THE INCREASED RISK OF INFECTION FROM A DETENTION 16 FACILITY. 17 THE COURT: SO YOU'RE SUGGESTING THAT SHE WOULD 18 TRAVEL ILLEGALLY TO MEXICO OR TO CANADA AND OBTAIN A PLANE 19 TICKET HOW WITHOUT A PASSPORT? 2.0 MR. HARKER: WELL, YOUR HONOR, I WOULD POINT OUT AGAIN THAT SHE NEED NOT GO TO CANADA OR MEXICO, SHE 21 2.2 COULD ONLY GO TO NORTH CAROLINA AND HIDE IN THE WOODS. THE COURT: WELL, BUT YOU CAN SPECULATE THAT 23 24 ABOUT ANY DEFENDANT.

MR. HARKER: RIGHT. WE'VE ESTABLISHED ALREADY,

25

THOSE MOTIVES ARE STILL APPLICABLE. IF ANYTHING, THE DEFENDANT IS NOW AWARE OF THE STRENGTH OF THE GOVERNMENT'S EVIDENCE AGAINST HER. IT'S BEEN A FULL YEAR, SHE HAS HAD AMPLE TIME TO REVIEW THE DISCOVERY, AND SHE UNDERSTANDS THAT CONVICTION IS -- THERE'S A HIGH LIKELIHOOD OF CONVICTION, THE EVIDENCE IS VERY STRONG; SO WHETHER HER DIFFICULTY OF TRAVELING TO CANADA OR MEXICO ARE POINTS THE GOVERNMENT CONCEDES DUE TO SOME SMALL DEGREE MITIGATE THE RISK, BUT THIS IS NOT JUST ANY DEFENDANT, THIS IS A DEFENDANT WITH SUBSTANTIAL TIES TO CHINA AND A SUBSTANTIAL MOTIVE TO FLEE; AND I WON'T REPEAT ALL THOSE RECORDS, I KNOW YOUR HONOR HAS READ THOSE RECORDS EARLIER. THE COURT: LET ME ASK YOU THIS, CAN'T THE RISK OF FLIGHT, WHATEVER IT IS, BE MITIGATED HERE BY THE COURT REOUIRING HOME CONFINEMENT WITH ELECTRONIC MONITORING AND OTHER KINDS OF SAFEGUARDS THAT REQUIRE MULTIPLE DAILY CONTACTS WITH THE PROBATION OFFICE?

YOUR HONOR, THE MOTIVES WHY THE DEFENDANT WOULD FLEE, AND

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

MR. HARKER: YOUR HONOR, I THINK IT CAN BE MITIGATED, BUT NOT TO THE POINT WHERE WE -- NOT ANY REASONABLE SET OF CONDITIONS THAT WOULD ASSURE HER APPEARANCE AT TRIAL; AND I WOULD ADD THAT PRECISELY AS A RESULT OF THE CORONAVIRUS THE ABILITY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT TO EFFECTUATE THE TERMS OF THE COURT ORDER ABOUT CONDITIONS OF RELEASE IS ITSELF UNDERMINED. MY UNDERSTANDING

IS THAT MONITORING GPS BY THE PROBATION OFFICE WERE, IF WE WERE EVEN TO ATTEMPT TO ASSIGN AN FBI AGENT OR SERIES OF AGENTS TO DO THIS, IT IS SEVERELY UNDERMINED. IN FACT, YOUR HONOR, I HAD EXTREME DIFFICULTY DELIVERING A TARGET LETTER JUST LAST WEEK, AND WE HAD TO END UP USING CERTIFIED MAIL TO DELIVER A TARGET LETTER TO A DEFENDANT IN A MAJOR CASE.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

SO, AGAIN, YOUR HONOR, THE GOVERNMENT'S POSITION IS THAT, YES, THERE IS AN INCREASED RISK OF INFECTION IN THE JAIL. I DON'T KNOW IF THAT INCREASED RISK IS, WHETHER IT'S SIZEABLE OR WHETHER IT'S NEGLIGIBLE, BUT I THINK IT'S FAIR TO CONCEDE THE COURT'S POINT THAT IT IS A HIGHER RISK THAN LIVING ON A FARM BY YOURSELF; BUT, ON THE OTHER HAND, THE DEFENDANT'S RISK OF FLIGHT IS AT LEAST AS GREAT AS IT WAS LAST YEAR WHEN THE GOVERNMENT WON THIS ARGUMENT WITH THE MAGISTRATE AND ON APPEAL AT THE DISTRICT COURT LEVEL; AND FROM THE GOVERNMENT'S VIEW IT'S ACTUALLY STRONGER NOW IN LIGHT OF THE PENDING TRIAL AND THE STRENGTH OF THE GOVERNMENT'S EVIDENCE, AS WELL AS THE DIFFICULTY THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH WOULD HAVE AND THE PROBATION OFFICE WOULD HAVE IN ENFORCING THE COURT'S CONDITIONS OF RELEASE. AND I HAVE REVIEWED THE CONDI-TIONS, AND I SEE THAT THEY LARGELY TRACK THE GOVERNMENT'S REQUEST, BUT I DON'T THINK THAT THEY SUFFICIENTLY MITIGATE THE RISK TO ASSURE THE DEFENDANT'S APPEARANCE AT TRIAL.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, MR. HARKER.

ANYTHING ELSE, MR. SHIPLEY?

2.0

2.2

MR. SHIPLEY: YOUR HONOR, IF, IF IT EVEN NEEDS
TO BE ADDRESSED, JUDGE, I WOULD TAKE EXCEPTION WITH THE
GOVERNMENT'S POSITION ON HOW THE -- NOW THE DEFENDANT IN
THIS CASE, DR. YOU, AND BOTH HER AND HER HUSBAND HAVE MADE
FALSE STATEMENTS TO INDUCE ANYTHING, JUDGE. AGAIN, AGAIN,
JUDGE, THERE WAS NEVER ANY INTENTIONAL MISREPRESENTATION
TO ANYONE BY ANYONE. I THINK THE CHARACTERIZATION THERE
IS A LITTLE SHORTSIGHTED. JUST ASSUMING, ASSUMING THAT
THAT WOULD BE THE CASE, JUDGE, BUT THAT'S NOT THE CASE.
THAT'S NOT THE CASE THAT THEY HAVE, HER HUSBAND AND
DR. YOU HAVE CONSPIRED TO MAKE SOME WRONG STATEMENTS THAT
WOULD NOW CAUSE HER FLIGHT RISK TO INCREASE BECAUSE OF
THAT, JUDGE. THERE IS NO --

THE COURT: WELL, AT LEAST TO THIS EXTENT,

MR. SHIPLEY, I DISAGREE WITH YOU A BIT BECAUSE IF HER

CREDIBILITY IS SUSPECT, FURTHER SUSPECT AT THIS POINT,

THEN IT DOES INCREASE THE RISK OF FLIGHT IN MY VIEW. AND

I DON'T -- YOU KNOW, I READ THE LANGUAGE FROM YOUR PLEAD
ING, THAT LANGUAGE, THAT WAS NOT CORRECT. THE JOHNSON

CITY PROPERTY, THE WASHINGTON COUNTY PROPERTY WAS NOT

AVAILABLE FOR HER TO LIVE IN BECAUSE THERE IS A LEASE, AND

IT'S OBVIOUSLY A WRITTEN LEASE. THE GOVERNMENT HAS A COPY

COPY OF THAT LEASE, AND THERE WAS NEVER ANY EFFORT BY
ANYBODY TO CORRECT THAT, AND SO THAT'S THE REAL ISSUE.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

I MEAN, I THINK ALL OF YOU KNOW HOW IMPORTANT CANDOR WITH THE COURT IS, TO ME, AT LEAST, AND THERE'S ONLY ONE POSSIBLE WAY IN MY OPINION TO READ THOSE SENTENCES THAT I READ FROM YOUR PLEADING; BUT, NEVERTHELESS, THE BIGGER ISSUE IS DOES THAT CAUSE HER CREDIBILITY OR THE TRUSTWORTHINESS OF HER PROMISES TO THE COURT TO BE MORE SUSPECT THAN THEY WERE BEFORE, AND THAT'S, THAT'S WHAT TROUBLES ME. I MEAN, I'M NOT SURE WHY IT WAS EVEN PROPOSED THAT SHE LIVE IN THE WASHINGTON COUNTY PROPERTY IN THE FIRST PLACE SINCE IT WAS NOT AVAILABLE.

MR. JESSEE: YOUR HONOR, MAY I SPEAK JUST A I CAN'T SEE YOU, SO I CAN'T -- THIS IS TOM MINUTE? I TALKED TO THE REALTORS THIS TIME AND THE TIME JESSEE. THERE IS A POSSIBILITY, WHICH WE WOULD HAVE BEFORE. SOLIDIFIED ONE WAY OR THE OTHER, AS TO WHETHER THE TENANTS WERE WILLING TO VACATE UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES. CORRECT, WE COULD NOT JUST GO KICK THEM OUT, BUT THERE WAS AND IS, DEPENDING ON WHAT WE DEVELOPED AS THE PLAN. SO I'LL TAKE THE BLAME FOR THE WAY THE WORDING WAS PUT IN THERE, BUT THERE IS A POSSIBILITY BECAUSE I KNEW THAT THERE WAS APARTMENTS AVAILABLE WE WERE GOING TO ASK THOSE PEOPLE TO MOVE TO UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES, BUT WE WERE TRYING TO FIGURE OUT, THIS WHOLE THING MR. HARKER SAID

WE'VE BEEN TRYING TO FIGURE OUT SINCE DAY ONE WHEN THIS LOCKDOWN STARTED WHETHER HE'D GET LOCKED DOWN OR NOT. WE TALKED ABOUT WITH THE PROBATION OFFICER EVERYTHING DR. YOU OWNS AS FAR AS CLOTHING AND STUFF IS IN THE ATLANTA AREA. AND SHE WOULD HAVE TO GO THERE TO GET HER BELONGINGS. IT'S MY FAULT IT WASN'T CONCRETE, AND I'LL TAKE THE BLAME FOR IT, BUT IT CERTAINLY WASN'T DONE OTHER THAN AS AN ALTERNATIVE. I ASSURE YOU THAT ON MONDAY WHEN I WALKED INTO JUDGE WYRICK'S COURT, I WOULD HAVE GIVEN HER THE PLAN AND DIDN'T EVEN ANTICIPATE GETTING TALKED TO BY THE, BY THE PROBATION OFFICE BEFORE THEN. SO I WANT TO APOLOGIZE TO THE COURT, BUT WHEREVER YOUR HONOR -- SHOULD YOU DECIDE TO LET HER OUT, SHE'LL LIVE WHEREVER YOU TELL HER SHE HAS TO LIVE. THE COURT: MR. JESSEE, MR. SHIPLEY, WHAT KIND OF LIOUID ASSETS DOES DR. YOU HAVE ACCESS TO? MR. JESSEE: YOUR HONOR, I DIDN'T -- THE SOUND BLURB, I COULDN'T HEAR YOUR QUESTION. THE COURT: WHAT KIND OF LIQUID ASSETS DOES DR. YOU HAVE ACCESS TO? THEY HAVE, THEY HAVE THEIR BANK MR. JESSEE:

ABOUT DR. YOU'S HUSBAND NOT BEING WILLING TO COMMUTE,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

ACCOUNTS, WHICH HAVE BEEN SUBSTANTIALLY REDUCED THROUGH

THE COST OF THIS. DR. YOU'S HUSBAND IS WORKING EVERYDAY,

SO THEY HAVE THAT JOINT BANK ACCOUNT. I WOULD HAVE TO GET

2 TO THAT. 3 THE COURT: WOULD YOU SAY THEY ARE SUBSTANTIAL? 4 MR. JESSEE: I WOULD SAY THAT -- WELL, I DON'T 5 HAVE ANY WAY OF CONFERRING WITH DR. YOU. I'M JUST SENDING 6 A TEXT RIGHT NOW TO HER HUSBAND AS TO HOW MUCH MONEY HE 7 HAS IN THE BANK; AND I KNOW THAT BECAUSE OF THE COST OF 8 THIS PREPARATION THEY HAVE SPENT THE MAJORITY OF WHAT THEY 9 HAD, OR WHAT I WOULD CALL LIQUID ASSETS, BUT LET ME SEE IF HE ANSWERS IN A SECOND. IF -- HE USUALLY ANSWERS 10 11 RELATIVELY QUICKLY, SO LET ME -- YOUR HONOR, IF I COULD, 12 IF I COULD MUTE MY VIDEO HERE, I CAN CALL HIM AND THEN TURN IT BACK ON IF YOU WOULD PREFER. 13 14 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WHY DON'T YOU DO THAT. 15 MR. JESSEE: ALL RIGHT. 16 (MR. JESSEE MUTES HIS END OF THE CONFERENCE) 17 THE COURT: WHILE MR. JESSEE IS DOING THAT, 18 LET'S GO AHEAD AND ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF RESCHEDULING THIS 19 CASE FOR TRIAL. 2.0 MR. SHIPLEY, JUDGE WYRICK PUT DOWN A RATHER DETAILED ORDER ABOUT THE REQUEST FOR VIDEO CONFERENCING 21 2.2 AND, IN FACT, AGREED TO PERMIT VIDEO DEPOSITIONS TO BE 23 TAKEN. WHERE ARE YOU WITH ARRANGEMENTS TO DO THAT?

AN UPDATED LIST TO THE COURT AS TO WHAT'S AVAILABLE AS OF

1

24

25

UPDATE THIS MORNING ON THAT, JUDGE. WE HAVE, WE HAVE

MR. SHIPLEY: JUDGE, I WAS JUST PROVIDED AN

TALKED TO TWO COMPANIES THAT HAVE THE CAPABILITY TO SET UP THESE DEPOSITIONS IN CHINA. THE LAWYER IN PARTICULAR WE'VE BEEN TALKING TO THROUGH DR. YOU'S HUSBAND HAS AN INTERNATIONAL DEPARTMENT IN HIS LAW FIRM WHICH IS CAPABLE OF ASSISTING THESE DEPOSITIONS IN ENGLISH WHO THEY HAVE ALSO REACHED OUT NOT ONLY TO THEIR FIRM BUT ALSO A LARGER FIRM. THE TWO WITNESSES IN WEIHAL ARE NOW ALLOWED TO TRAVEL TO BEIJING BUT MUST QUARANTINE FOR 14 DAYS WHEN THEY GET THERE AND WHEN THEY RETURN.

2.0

2.1

2.2

RIGHT NOW, JUDGE, WE ARE CHECKING, WE ARE LOOKING INTO A CITY OUTSIDE OF BEIJING CLOSER TO WUHAN WHERE THE TRAVEL, WHERE THE TRAVEL MIGHT NOT BE AS RESTRICTED. WE'VE ALSO REACHED OUT, JUDGE --

THE COURT: AS I UNDERSTAND IT FROM THE NEWS,
THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT LIFTED SOME TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS
FROM WUHAN TO OTHER AREAS OF THE COUNTRY YESTERDAY.

MR. SHIPLEY: SO THAT'S WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO LOOK AT, JUDGE, AS FAR AS SOME PLACES THAT ARE CLOSER.
WE'VE ALSO REACHED OUT TO A HONG KONG LAW FIRM WITH OFFICES IN BEIJING.

WE'RE HOPING, JUDGE, TO BE ABLE TO PROVIDE, IF REQUIRED, JUDGE, AND I HAVE HERE IN MY NOTES THAT,
OBVIOUSLY WHAT THE COURT JUST SAID, THEY HAVE JUST AS OF YESTERDAY, BASED ON MY NOTES HERE LIKE YOU SAID, JUDGE,
THEY HAVE LIFTED SOME OF THE RESTRICTIONS, WHAT WE'RE

HOPING TO, WE'RE HOPING, JUDGE, WE'RE HOPING TO HAVE SOME MORE INFORMATION BY THE END OF THE WEEK SINCE EVERYTHING IS CHANGING. I --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

THE COURT: GIVE ME AN IDEA OF HOW LONG YOU REALISTICALLY THINK IT WILL TAKE YOU TO GET THESE DEPOSITIONS DONE.

MR. SHIPLEY: IF EVERYTHING GOES WELL THIS WEEK, JUDGE, FROM WHAT I UNDERSTAND, AND THE TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS BEING LIFTED LIKE THEY ARE NOW, OR NOT LIFTED BUT BEING MODIFIED, I GUESS I SHOULD SAY, I DON'T ENVISION IT TAKING MONTHS, JUDGE, BUT I DON'T ENVISION US BEING ABLE TO DO IT NEXT WEEK EITHER; AND I KNOW THAT THAT'S, THAT'S NOT A DEFINITIVE ANSWER AND WHAT THE COURT WANTED TO HEAR, BUT I THINK THAT JUST WITH EVERYTHING CHANGING, AND WE'RE HOPE -- LIKE I SAID, WE'RE TRYING TO -- WE LOOKED AT THE BEIJING POSSIBILITY, BUT NOW WE'RE LOOKING BECAUSE OF THE WUHAN TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS BEING MODIFIED, WE'RE TRYING TO GET SOMEWHERE DIFFERENT. WE'VE CONTACTED MULTIPLE ATTORNEYS, JUDGE, IN CHINA AND IN JAPAN, JUDGE, TO TRY TO SEE IF THERE'S SOMEWHERE ELSE WE CAN DO THIS THAT'S MORE MUTUALLY CONVENIENT, THAT WAY WE CAN EXPEDITE THIS.

THE COURT: HAVE YOU BEEN ABLE TO RESOLVE THE ISSUE AT THIS POINT OF WHETHER THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT WILL EVEN ALLOW THESE WITNESSES TO TESTIFY BY DEPOSITION, OR IF

SO UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES?

2.0

2.2

MR. SHIPLEY: JUDGE, I WOULD PROBABLY, IF THE COURT WOULD, I DON'T MEAN TO PUT MR. JESSEE ON THE SPOT THERE, BUT AS FAR AS THE LOGISTICAL NATURE OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK MR. JESSEE IF HE WOULDN'T MIND SPEAKING TO THAT, JUDGE, WITH THE RESTRICTION WITH THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT ISSUE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. JESSEE, ARE YOU BACK ON?

MR. JESSEE: I'M BACK ON, YOUR HONOR.

DR. YOU'S HUSBAND SAYS THEY HAVE \$90,000 IN BANK ACCOUNTS. THERE IS SOMEWHERE, HE DOESN'T KNOW BASED ON THE DROPS OF THE STOCK MARKET, SOMEWHERE COMBINED BETWEEN THE TWO OF THEM 400,000 PLUS OR MINUS IN RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS THROUGH THE COMPANIES THEY'VE WORKED FOR, BUT ACTUAL ACCESS TO CASH HE HAS \$90,000. THE HOUSE THAT THEY OWN IN THE ATLANTA AREA, WHICH I THINK IS SMYRNA, IS PAID FOR, HOWEVER.

AND AS FAR AS YOUR QUESTION ABOUT I -- YOU WORK THROUGH AN INTERPRETER WHEN I'VE BEEN TALKING TO CHINA, WE HAVEN'T GOT FINAL CONFIRMATION OF ANYTHING, BUT THE INTERNATIONAL LAW FIRM THERE IS, IS PROCESSING GETTING PERMISSION FROM THE GOVERNMENT TO ALLOW US TO TAKE THE DEPOSITIONS IN BEIJING IN A LAW OFFICE THAT'S SUITABLE TO YOUR HONOR'S, THE EARLIER ORDER OF THE COURT; AND I SPOKE

WITH THEM THE END OF LAST WEEK, AND WHERE THEY WERE, THE TWO WITNESSES -- THERE'S ONE WITNESS IN BEIJING, TWO IN WEIHAI, THEY ARE NOW ALLOWED TO TRAVEL FROM WEIHAI TO BEIJING, WHICH JUST OCCURRED RECENTLY. THEY HAVE A 14 DAY OUARANTINE GETTING THERE AND 14 DAYS WHEN THEY LEAVE, AND I KNOW WE'RE NOT WORRIED ABOUT WHEN THEY LEAVE. THEY SUGGESTED THAT THERE IS A SMALLER CITY WHICH DOESN'T HAVE OUITE THE LIMITATIONS ON TRAVEL THAT BELJING HAS THAT THEY WERE CHECKING ON. I'VE TALKED TO TWO INTERNATIONAL COMPANIES THAT DO VIDEO CONFERENCING AND DEPOSITION WORK, AND THEY'RE WANTING A LITTLE MORE INFORMATION AS TO WHEN WE WOULD TAKE THESE. SO THE BOTTOM LINE IS I SHOULD KNOW BY THE END OF THIS WEEK THAT THERE EITHER IS ANOTHER ACCEPTABLE TOWN FOR THE WITNESSES TO TRAVEL TO THAT HAS AN AMERICAN-STYLE LAW OFFICE THAT WE CAN TAKE THEM IN; OTHERWISE, AS I SAID, WHEN THE WITNESSES GET TO BEIJING, THEY'RE QUARANTINED FOR 14 DAYS, AND THE LAW FIRM HAS MADE THE REQUEST, BUT EVERY WITNESS AND THE ATTORNEYS THAT WE'RE TALKING TO HAVE PRETTY MUCH SAID THEY'RE NOT CONCERNED ABOUT THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT NOT APPROVING THESE DEPOSITIONS. I HAVE NO -- NOTHING TO GIVE ME ANY COMFORT ONE WAY OR THE OTHER BECAUSE I CAN'T TALK TO ANYBODY EXCEPT THROUGH THE INTERPRETER; BUT I, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE GET THROUGH TO NEXT WEEK SINCE THEY'VE ALLOWED TRAVEL NOW, AND I'LL FILE A REPORT WITH THE COURT WITH THE

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

EXACT PLAN ASSUMING NOW THAT THERE'S TRAVEL WE HAVE A PLAN.

2.2

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. YOU KNOW, ALL OF THAT SOUNDS VERY MUCH LIKE THE REPORT THAT YOU GAVE TO JUDGE WYRICK EARLIER. THERE ARE POSSIBILITIES, YOU'VE TALKED TO PEOPLE. WE NEED TO START PINNING THIS DOWN IN TERMS OF ALL THESE DETAILS SO THAT WE DETERMINE WHETHER THESE DEPOSITIONS CAN OR CANNOT GO FORWARD, AND WE NEED TO DO THAT RELATIVELY QUICKLY. BEYOND THAT, I'LL LEAVE IT IN YOUR HANDS TO, TO DO THAT. I WILL -- I DO WANT YOU TO FILE A STATUS REPORT THOUGH WITH THE COURT WITHIN A WEEK TO GIVE ME SPECIFICS ON WHERE YOU ARE WITH THESE POSSIBILITIES.

I MEAN, NUMBER ONE, YOU NEED TO DETERMINE THAT THERE'S NO IMPEDIMENT THAT THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT WILL RAISE TO THE TAKING OF DEPOSITIONS; NUMBER TWO, THAT THE WITNESSES CAN TRAVEL AND WHEN YOU ANTICIPATE DOING THE DEPOSITION; AND, THIRD, I GUESS, HOW LONG YOU EXPECT THIS PROCESS TO TAKE BEFORE WE CAN HAVE THIS TESTIMONY CAPTURED, SO A WEEK FROM TODAY --

MR. JESSEE: YOUR HONOR --

THE COURT: I'M SORRY, GO AHEAD.

MR. JESSEE: FOR YOUR PLANNING RIGHT NOW, EACH ONE OF THE WITNESSES WHEN I TALKED TO THEM ON FRIDAY, THE WITNESSES ARE NOT THE IMPEDIMENT, THEY ARE, THEY ARE

PREPARED TO APPEAR; AND OTHER THAN ONCE THEY OPENED UP THE TRAVEL, WHICH THEY DID LAST WEEK, NONE OF THEM HAVE GIVEN ME ANY REAL CONCERN. IT'S NAILING DOWN THE GOVERNMENT'S PERMISSION AND THE LAW FIRM'S SET-UP, SO I'LL HAVE A REPORT BY A WEEK FROM TODAY.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

MR. HARKER: YOUR HONOR, MAY I COMMENT ON THIS?

THE COURT: YOU MAY, SURE.

MR. HARKER: I'M NOT AN EXPERT ON INTERNATIONAL LAW, BUT MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT IN ORDER FOR THE DEFENSE TO CONDUCT THESE DEPOSITIONS ON CHINESE SOIL THEY ARE REQUIRED TO COMPLY WITH THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S LETTERS OF ROGATORY PROCESS, WHICH AS FAR AS I AM ABLE TO DISCERN INVOLVES FOUR STEPS. FIRST, THE DEFENSE MUST DRAFT LETTERS OF ROGATORY AND SUBMIT THEM TO THE COURT; SECOND, THE COURT MUST REVIEW THOSE LETTERS OF ROGATORY, DETERMINE WHETHER THEY SATISFY THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S REQUIREMENTS AND THEN SUBMIT THOSE LETTERS OF ROGATORY TO THE STATE DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSMISSION TO THE CHINESE AUTHORITIES THROUGH THE APPROPRIATE DIPLOMATIC CHANNELS ALONG WITH A LETTER OF TRANSLATION; AND STEP THREE, THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT WOULD HAVE TO REVIEW AND THEN NOTIFY THE STATE DEPARTMENT AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THEY'RE GOING TO APPROVE OF THE PROCESS; AND THEN AT STEP FOUR, IF APPROVED BY THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT, THE STATE DEPARTMENT WOULD NOTIFY THE

COURT THAT THE DEPOSITIONS COULD PROCEED ACCORDINGLY, AT WHICH POINT ALL OF JUDGE WYRICK'S OTHER CONDITIONS WOULD STILL APPLY. SO I DON'T HAVE ANY SENSE AS TO HOW LONG THAT PROCESS WOULD TAKE.

2.0

2.2

I DO HAVE ONE OTHER CONCERN, WHICH MY

RECOLLECTION OF JUDGE WYRICK'S ORDER, IT WAS A LITTLE

AMBIGUOUS, BUT IT MAY HAVE CONTEMPLATED THAT THE ATTORNEYS

FOR THE GOVERNMENT AND THE DEFENSE WOULD BE PHYSICALLY

PRESENT IN CHINA. IF THAT'S --

THE COURT: IT WAS A LITTLE UNCLEAR, BUT I THINK THAT'S IMPRACTICAL.

MR. HARKER: I WOULD SAY THAT IT IS, AND IT'S PARTICULARLY CONFUSING IN LIGHT OF THE RISK OF FLIGHT OF THE DEFENDANT AND THE ARGUMENT THAT SHE CAN'T GET TO CHINA.

THE COURT: MR. JESSEE, HAVE YOU CONTACTED THE STATE DEPARTMENT?

MR. JESSEE: I HAVE NOT CONTACTED OUR STATE
DEPARTMENT, YOUR HONOR; BUT OUR LAWYER IN CHINA, I SENT
MR. HARKER'S SUBMISSION THAT HE JUST WENT THROUGH OVER
THERE TO ASK THEM WHAT THEIR UNDERSTANDING WAS AS TO WHAT
WE WERE GOING TO HAVE TO DO TO GET THE INFORMATION
NECESSARY, IF WE HAD TO GO THROUGH WHAT MR. HARKER JUST
DESCRIBED. THEY ASSURED ME THEY ARE WORKING ON IT FROM
THEIR END, AND THEY BELIEVE THEY WILL HAVE PERMISSION TO

BE ABLE TO DO THE DEPOSITIONS IN BEIJING; AND THAT'S ALL I KNOW.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

2.0

2.2

MR. JESSEE: ALL I TOLD THEM WAS I KNOW FROM OUR COCOUNSEL THAT WE WERE WORKING WITH AT THE BEGINNING THE PROBLEM WITH TAKING A DEPOSITION IN CHINA IS US SHOWING UP IN CHINA WITHOUT CLEARANCE AND THEY WILL ARREST US. IF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT CLEARS THE WITNESS THERE TO APPEAR AND WE TAKE IT BY VIDEO CONFERENCE, THERE IS NOT APPARENTLY THE HEIGHT OF CONCERN. ALL I'M DOING IS RELYING ON WHAT THE INTERNATIONAL LAW FIRM THAT WAS RECOMMENDED TO ME BY THE LAW FIRM IN LOS ANGELES TO TALK TO AND DEAL WITH.

ORIGINALLY, WE HAD TALKED ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY
OF BRINGING THE WITNESSES OUT TO HONG KONG JUST BECAUSE
THERE'S A TREATY THAT FACILITATES IT VERY EASILY, AND AT
THIS POINT THEY CAN'T TRAVEL TO HONG KONG. SO I WILL
REPORT IN A WEEK TO TELL HOPEFULLY HOW LONG AND WHAT IT
WILL TAKE TO GET IT DONE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. LET ME THROW OUT THREE
POTENTIAL TRIAL DATES, AND YOU CAN REACT TO THESE; AND
THESE MAY BE THE EARLIEST TRIAL DATES WE CAN FIND, BUT
THEY ALSO MAY BE THE LATEST WE CAN FIND AND STILL
ACCOMMODATE THE COURT'S SCHEDULE AND TO SOME EXTENT
MR. HARKER'S SCHEDULE. WE HAVE A MULTI-WEEK TRIAL

1	SCHEDULED FOR WHEN IS THAT, MID SEPTEMBER?
2	MR. HARKER: YES, YOUR HONOR; AND I WOULD URGE
3	THE COURT TO SCHEDULE THIS MATTER WITHOUT REGARD TO THAT
4	MATTER.
5	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
6	MR. HARKER: TO CHOP THE WOOD THAT'S IN FRONT
7	OF US.
8	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I WON'T TRY TO READ
9	BETWEEN THE LINES ON THAT.
10	THE MOST LIKELY DATES ARE AND, OBVIOUSLY,
11	THERE'S SOME UNCERTAINTY HERE, I DO NOT KNOW HOW LONG ALL
12	THESE CONCERNS WILL LAST; BUT JULY 14, 21 OR 28.
13	MR. HARKER: YOUR HONOR, FOR THE GOVERNMENT,
14	JULY 14TH OR JULY 21ST WOULD WORK. JULY 28TH WOULD THE
15	END OF THAT, IF THE TRIAL LASTS A LITTLE UNDER TWO WEEKS,
16	THE END OF THAT WOULD CONFLICT WITH ONE OF MY COCOUNSEL'S
17	SCHEDULES, SO WE WOULD PREFER JULY 14TH OR JULY 21ST.
18	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. SHIPLEY,
19	MR. JESSEE?
20	MR. JESSEE: SUBJECT TO REPORTING TO THE COURT
21	WHAT THIS POSSIBILITY OF THE VIDEO DEPOSITION, JULY 14TH
22	ON MY SCHEDULE IS BETTER.
23	THE COURT: MR. SHIPLEY, WHAT DOES YOUR
24	CALENDAR LOOK LIKE?
25	MR. SHIPLEY: JUDGE, I CAN MAKE EITHER ONE OF

1 THOSE WORK. I MEAN, I HAVE A, I HAVE A FAMILY OBLIGATION 2 THAT I HAD SET THERE FOR THE WEEK OF THE 14TH, BUT, OBVIOUSLY, IF THAT'S NOT CONVENIENT WITH THE COURT, SO I 3 4 WILL DO THE 21ST, I COULD DO THE 21ST; BUT, JUDGE, THIS 5 TAKES PRECEDENCE. 6 MR. JESSEE: 21ST IS FINE, OR THE 14TH JUDGE, I 7 CAN DO EITHER ONE. 8 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ARE YOU PLANNING A 9 VACATION ON THE 14TH? 10 MR. SHIPLEY: JUDGE, I WAS; BUT, JUDGE, WITH 11 ALL THE UNCERTAINTY, I DON'T KNOW THAT I'LL BE GOING ANYWHERE; BUT ALSO, JUDGE, I WANT TO SAY THIS TRIAL WOULD 12 TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER ANY TYPE OF VACATION THING THAT I 13 14 WOULD HAVE. I MEAN, THE CHANCES OF ME GOING ON VACATION 15 ON, IF THIS TRIAL WERE SET ON THE 21ST, OF COURSE, FOR 16 THAT TIME IT'S HIGHLY UNLIKELY ANYWAY, SO. 17 THE COURT: YOU'RE LIVING DANGEROUSLY BY SAYING 18 THAT WITHOUT CONSULTING WITH YOUR WIFE AND CHILDREN. 19 MR. SHIPLEY: FAIR POINT, JUDGE. 20 THE COURT: WELL, HOW ABOUT THE 21ST? 21 MR. SHIPLEY: FINE, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU. 2.2 THE COURT: AND IF TWO WEEKS IS THE LENGTH, 23 THEN IT SOUNDS LIKE WE CAN PROBABLY BE DONE IN ORDER TO 24 ACCOMMODATE THE CONFLICTS WITH GOVERNMENT'S COUNSEL AS

25

WELL.

1	ALL RIGHT. WE'LL RESET THE TRIAL FOR JANUARY
2	21ST THEN.
3	THE CLERK: JULY.
4	THE COURT: NOT JANUARY. I'VE GOTTEN RUSTY.
5	DR. YOU, I DIDN'T KNOW THIS HAD BEEN PREPARED,
6	BUT THERE WAS SOMETHING I SHOULD HAVE DONE WITH YOU RIGHT
7	AT THE BEGINNING OF THE HEARING. THE CLERK HAS JUST
8	HANDED ME A CONSENT TO APPEAR BY VIDEO CONFERENCE THAT HAS
9	BEEN SIGNED APPARENTLY BY YOUR ATTORNEY WITH YOUR CONSENT
10	AGREEING TO WAIVE YOUR RIGHT TO BE PERSONALLY PRESENT HERE
11	TODAY AND APPEAR BY VIDEO CONFERENCE. DID YOU AUTHORIZE
12	THE PLACEMENT OF YOUR SIGNATURE ON THIS DOCUMENT?
13	THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR.
14	THE COURT: AND YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THIS WAIVES
15	YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAR HERE IN COURT PERSONALLY FOR THIS
16	PROCEEDING?
17	THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR.
18	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AND HAVE ANY THREATS OR
19	PROMISES BEEN MADE TO YOU BY ANYONE TO CONVINCE YOU TO
20	SIGN THIS DOCUMENT?
21	THE DEFENDANT: NO, YOUR HONOR.
22	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AND DID YOU REVIEW THE
23	DOCUMENT WITH YOUR ATTORNEYS BEFORE YOU AUTHORIZED THE
24	PLACEMENT OF YOUR SIGNATURE ON IT?
25	THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR.

1 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THEN I'LL MAKE A 2 FINDING TO THE EXTENT NECESSARY THAT THE CONSENT TO APPEAR 3 AND THE WAIVERS CONTAINED THEREIN IS KNOWINGLY AND 4 VOLUNTARILY MADE, AND I WILL APPROVE IT. 5 THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR. 6 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. COUNSEL, ANYTHING ELSE 7 WE NEED TO ADDRESS TODAY? 8 MR. SHIPLEY: NOTHING FURTHER FROM ME, YOUR 9 HONOR. MR. HARKER: YOUR HONOR, I JUST HAD A FEW EXTRA 10 11 POINTS THAT I THINK WE COULD ADDRESS EXPEDITIOUSLY. 12 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. HARKER: ONE IS THERE WAS A HEARING ABOUT A 13 MONTH AGO WHERE THERE WAS SOME CONFUSION, I THINK, AT 14 15 LEAST ON THE GOVERNMENT'S PART, ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT 16 WANTED TO PUT ON THE RECORD THAT THE DEFENSE HAD MADE A 17 STRATEGIC DECISION NOT TO REQUEST THE GOVERNMENT'S EXPERT 18 DISCLOSURES. 19 THE COURT: EXPERTS, YES. 2.0 MR. HARKER: AND THAT'S THEIR RIGHT, THEY'RE 21 ABSOLUTELY ABLE TO DO THAT, IT WOULD TRIGGER THE 2.2 RECIPROCAL OBLIGATION ON THEIR BEHALF WERE THEY TO REQUEST 23 THE GOVERNMENT'S EXPERT DISCLOSURES; BUT WE HAVE NOT 24 PROVIDED THAT INFORMATION TO THEM BECAUSE THEY HAVE NOT

REQUESTED IT, THAT'S ONE ISSUE.

25

1 AT SOME POINT I THINK WE NEED TO HAVE A 2 LAFLER/FRYE HEARING, AND THEN ALSO THERE IS A 120 PAGE 3 TRANSCRIPT OF AN INTERVIEW. WE HAVE PROVIDED THAT 4 TRANSCRIPT TO THE DEFENSE. I THINK WE'VE ASKED THEM TO --5 THE COURT: JUST A MINUTE. THAT BACKGROUND NOISE, THAT NOISE IS GETTING WORSE, IS THAT THE PROBLEM 6 7 YOU WERE TALKING TO ME EARLIER ABOUT? 8 MR. DEMBO {IT DEPARTMENT}: YES, IT'S FROM 9 MR. JESSEE'S LINE. MR. JESSEE: I CAN BARELY HEAR, JUDGE. 10 11 THE COURT: WELL, I THINK ALL THE BACKGROUND 12 NOISE THAT WE'RE HEARING HERE IS COMING FROM YOUR PHONE. IF YOU WILL MUTE IT, I THINK THAT MIGHT CORRECT -- I GUESS 13 HE LEFT US. 14 15 MR. JESSEE: NO, I'M ON MUTE. 16 THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. 17 MR. JESSEE: I'LL MUTE. 18 THE COURT: IF YOU MUTE IT, THAT SOUNDS LIKE 19 THAT SOLVES THE PROBLEM, AT LEAST PARTIALLY. ALL RIGHT. GO AHEAD, MR. HARKER, I'M SORRY. 20 21 MR. HARKER: SO, YOUR HONOR, I DON'T KNOW IF WE 2.2 NEED TO DISCUSS THESE ISSUES TODAY, BUT THERE IS THE 23 REQUEST FOR THE GOVERNMENT'S EXPERT DISCLOSURES; SECOND, 24 THERE'S -- IN ORDER TO AVOID IDEALLY A ROBINSON HEARING ON 25 A LENGTHY TWO PLUS HOUR INTERVIEW, TRANSCRIBED INTERVIEW,

THE GOVERNMENT HAS PROVIDED A TRANSCRIPT TO THE DEFENSE.

WE HAVE PROPOSED SOME CORRECTIONS TO IT, WE HAVE ASKED

THEM TO GET BACK TO US, WE HOPE THEY CAN DO THAT PROMPTLY;

BUT IN THE EVENT THAT THERE ARE SOME AREA OF DISAGREEMENT,

OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE COURT'S ORDER ON DISCOVERY AND

SCHEDULING IS THAT THE PARTIES MUST IDENTIFY FOR THE COURT

WHERE THE AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT ARE. THE GOVERNMENT HAS

PROVIDED THAT INFORMATION TO THE DEFENSE, SO THE BALL IS

IN THEIR COURT; AND THEN, THIRD, AT SOME POINT, MAYBE NOT

TODAY, WE WOULD ASK THAT WE PUT ON THE RECORD THAT THE

DEFENDANT HAS FORMALLY REJECTED THE GOVERNMENT'S PLEA

OFFER.

2.0

2.2

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I DON'T USUALLY DO A

LAFLER/FRYE HEARING THIS EARLY IN THE PROCEEDINGS SIMPLY

BECAUSE THINGS CHANGE AS WE APPROACH TRIAL, AND I WILL DO

THAT MUCH CLOSER TO TRIAL.

MR. SHIPLEY, WHAT IS GOING ON WITH THE EXPERT DISCLOSURES, DO YOU INTEND TO SEEK RECIPROCAL DISCLOSURE AT SOME POINT IN THIS CASE?

MR. SHIPLEY: YES, YOUR HONOR. AND AS THE COURT CAN PROBABLY TELL, THAT WAS AN ISSUE THAT WAS A POINT OF CONTENTION DURING OUR LAST HEARING. ANY INSINUATION THAT IT WAS -- AND MR. HARKER IS RIGHT, IT IS, IT CAN BE A STRATEGIC DECISION; HOWEVER, JUDGE, THAT IS NOT THE CASE HERE. AS A MATTER OF FACT, JUDGE, MR. JESSEE

AND I SPOKE, SPOKE ABOUT THIS, WE, WE RECEIVED AN E-MAIL FROM MR. HARKER AT 11:27 THIS MORNING, AND I ASSUMED THAT THIS WOULD BE BROUGHT UP TO THE COURT.

2.0

2.2

MR. JESSEE HAS INFORMED ME THAT HIS, HIS
ASSOCIATE THAT HE HAS, HE'S REQUESTED THAT SHE COMPLETE
THE REQUEST FOR THE EXPERT DISCLOSURE, AND SHE'S NOT BEEN
TO WORK IN THE PAST FEW DAYS BECAUSE SHE HAS PINK EYE AND
MR. JESSEE DOESN'T WANT HER ANYWHERE AROUND THE OFFICE. I
OVERHEARD THE CONVERSATION WITH HE AND HER THIS MORNING,
THAT'S SOMETHING HE HAS REQUESTED.

JUDGE, FROM OUR STANDPOINT WE ARE STILL WAITING ON OUR REPORT, AND THAT'S SOMETHING THAT IT'S NOT, IT'S NOT ANYTHING, JUDGE, THAT IT HAS BEEN A STRATEGIC ISSUE, IT'S A MATTER OF WE'VE MADE THAT DECISION, WE'VE DISCUSSED THAT, AND IT'S PENDING AS SOON AS -- WE SHOULD HAVE THAT TO THE GOVERNMENT WITHIN A WEEK, OUR REQUEST FOR ANY TYPE OF EXPERT DISCLOSURES, AND WE WILL OBVIOUSLY PROVIDE ANYTHING THAT WE HAVE WHEN WE OBTAIN IT.

THE COURT: WHEN DO YOU ANTICIPATE GETTING AN EXPERT REPORT?

MR. SHIPLEY: THE LAST TIME, JUDGE, THAT

MR. JESSEE AND I SPOKE ABOUT THIS, AND TALKING WITH OUR

EXPERT, WE, WE -- WE'RE EXPECTING THAT REPORT, JUDGE, ANY

DAY FROM HIM; AND THAT'S SOMETHING, LIKE I SAID, JUDGE,

ONCE WE, ONCE WE REQUEST THAT FROM THE GOVERNMENT, JUDGE,

WHICH SHOULD BE FORTHCOMING WITHIN THE NEXT -- HONESTLY,

JUDGE, IF WE CAN GET IT TO THEM TOMORROW, WE WILL; BUT

THAT'S SOMETHING IF I HAVE TO DRAFT IT, JUDGE, IT'S

SOMETHING I'LL DO; BUT THAT WAS SOMETHING WE HAD GIVEN HER

TO DO, AND IT WILL BE FORTHCOMING, JUDGE; BUT I DON'T SEE

ANY TYPE OF UNDUE DELAY FROM OUR EXPERT REPORT. I THINK

HE HAS GONE THROUGH MOST OF EVERYTHING THAT HE HAS HAD

ACCESS TO DO, JUDGE.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

THAT'S ANOTHER THING THAT WE'RE HOPING TO PROVIDE TO THE COURT, ANOTHER THING THAT -- I DON'T KNOW THAT THE COURT NEEDS TO ADDRESS THAT NOW BECAUSE WE'RE HOPING WE CAN COME TO AN AGREEMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT ON ANOTHER SUBSEQUENT MODIFICATION OF THIS PROTECTIVE ORDER IN THIS CASE, JUDGE. THE -- MR. HARKER'S COCOUNSEL, WE HAVE BEEN IN CONTACT WITH HIM ABOUT MODIFYING THIS PROTECTIVE ORDER TO HAVE EASIER ACCESS TO THE DISCOVERY MATERIAL. WE HAVE SENT A LENGTHY E-MAIL TO MR. WALCZEWSKI ABOUT SAFEKEEPING OF THE MATERIAL. WE HAVE DESCRIBED THE SAFES THAT MR. JESSEE AND I BOTH HAVE THAT WE CAN STORE THE MATERIAL, THE QUOTE, UNQUOTE, TRADE SECRET MATERIAL. THAT'S SOMETHING ELSE, JUDGE, THAT WE DON'T WANT TO PRESENT TO THE COURT AT THIS POINT BECAUSE WE THINK WE'RE WORKING TOWARD A RESOLUTION ON PROVIDING THE COURT WITH SOMETHING OF AN AGREEMENT TO MODIFY THE PROTECTIVE ORDER TO ALLOW EASIER ACCESS TO THE DISCOVERY; AND I THINK,

1	JUDGE, THAT I CAN SAY THIS WITH A HIGH DEGREE OF
2	CERTAINTY, IF THE REASON IT'S TAKING A LONG TIME TO
3	AND THIS IS NO, THIS IS NO CASTING STONES AGAINST THE
4	GOVERNMENT BECAUSE WE UNDERSTAND THEIR POSITION, BUT IT'S
5	THE ACCESS OUR EXPERT HAS HAD TO THE MATERIAL. IT WAS
6	HERE, AND THEN THEY WERE VERY ACCOMMODATING TO TAKE IT OUT
7	TO THE FBI OFFICE IN LOS ANGELES, BUT IT'S A MATTER OF
8	WHAT YOU CAN TAKE IN AND WHAT YOU CAN TAKE OUT; AND I
9	THINK, JUDGE, THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WE ARE WORKING TOWARD
10	GETTING THE COURT SOMETHING PENDING THE COURT'S APPROVAL
11	OF MODIFYING THAT PROTECTIVE ORDER.
12	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IT SOUNDS LIKE YOU
13	WON'T HAVE ANY TROUBLE THEN MAKING YOUR REQUEST FOR EXPERT
14	DISCLOSURES WITHIN 14 DAYS?
15	MR. SHIPLEY: NO, JUDGE, THAT WILL NOT BE A
16	PROBLEM.
17	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THEN THE DEFENDANT WILL
18	MAKE THAT REQUEST WITHIN 14 DAYS OF TODAY.
19	AND DID I DON'T HAVE THE SCHEDULING ORDER IN
20	FRONT OF ME, WAS THERE A DATE SET IN THAT SCHEDULING ORDER
21	THEN FOR THE DISCLOSURE BY THE DEFENDANT?
22	MR. HARKER: THERE WAS NOT, YOUR HONOR.
23	THE COURT: WHAT DO YOU SUGGEST IS A REASONABLE
24	TIME, MR. HARKER?
25	MR. HARKER: YOUR HONOR, I AS LONG AS WE

HAVE IT TWO MONTHS IN ADVANCE OF TRIAL, A MONTH IN ADVANCE

OF TRIAL, THAT'S SUFFICIENT. I THINK THE ISSUE IS JUST

PROTECTING THE RECORD HERE PRIMARILY.

2.0

2.2

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THEN THE PLAINTIFFS -I MEAN THE DEFENDANT WILL FILE THE REQUEST WITHIN 14 DAYS,
THAT WILL TRIGGER THEN THE REQUIREMENT THAT THE DEFENDANT
MAKE EXPERT DISCLOSURES WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THAT.

MR. HARKER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: I ADDRESSED LAFLER/FRYE.

WHAT'S YOUR PERSPECTIVE ON THIS TRANSCRIPT ISSUE AND THE NEED FOR A ROBINSON HEARING, MR. SHIPLEY?

MR. SHIPLEY: JUDGE, I HAVE LOOKED THROUGH THE TRANSCRIPT AT LENGTH, I DON'T THINK IT'S GOING TO BE NECESSARY TO HAVE A ROBINSON HEARING. I THINK THAT'S SOMETHING THAT I BELIEVE MR. HARKER AND I HAVE EVEN DISCUSSED THAT ABOUT THE CERTAIN STIPULATIONS THAT WE CAN POSSIBLY DO GOING INTO TRIAL. THERE IS SOME INCONSISTENCIES WITHIN THAT, JUDGE, SOME SPELLING AND SOME WORDS THAT I THINK ARE OUT OF CONTEXT, BUT THAT'S SOMETHING I THINK I CAN TAKE UP WITH MR. HARKER, AND I THINK WE CAN REACH AN AGREEMENT ON THAT ABOUT CERTAIN THINGS WITHOUT RESORTING TO HAVING A ROBINSON HEARING.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. OBVIOUSLY, A ROBINSON
HEARING INVOLVING A TRANSCRIPT THIS LONG COULD TAKE A FAIR
AMOUNT OF TIME. I GUESS MY CONCERN HERE IS THAT WE NEED

TO GET THAT DONE AS FAR IN ADVANCE OF THE TRIAL DATE AS POSSIBLE. CAN YOU COMPLETE YOUR REVIEW OF THAT TRANSCRIPT AND GIVE THE COURT A NOTICE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF WHETHER THERE WILL BE A ROBINSON HEARING REQUIRED?

MR. SHIPLEY: JUDGE, I'LL DO SO.

2.0

2.2

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THAT SATISFACTORY,
MR. HARKER?

MR. HARKER: YES, IT IS, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AND AS FAR AS THE PROTECTIVE ORDER MODIFICATION IS CONCERNED, MR. SHIPLEY, I DON'T HAVE ANYTHING BEFORE ME AT THIS POINT. HOPEFULLY YOU ALL CAN REACH A, AN AGREEMENT ON THAT. I -- I TAKE IT IF DR. YOU IS RELEASED ON BOND, THAT SOME OF THE CONCERNS ABOUT THAT BECOME MOOT? I MEAN, SHE IS -- I MEAN, YOU'RE TELLING ME SHE'S LIVING WITHIN A HALF MILE OF THE FBI'S OFFICE, IT SEEMS TO ME THAT HER REVIEW OF THOSE DOCUMENTS AT THE FBI'S OFFICE WOULD BE FAR, FAR PREFERABLE TO WHAT YOU HAVE NOW.

MR. SHIPLEY: IT WOULD BE, JUDGE, AND THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WE'VE TALKED A LOT ABOUT IN THE PROTECTIVE ORDER THAT WAS PRIOR TO -- WE'VE BEEN DISCUSSING THAT FOR QUITE SOME TIME, JUDGE, WITH THE GOVERNMENT AS A MODIFICATION; BUT, YES, JUDGE, I MEAN, THAT, THE ELEPHANT -- THE PROVERBIAL ELEPHANT IN THE ROOM HERE IF SHE WERE TO BE

RELEASED ON SOME TYPE OF BOND, THEN THAT WOULD ALLOW EASIER ACCESS TO LOOK AT THE MATERIAL, JUDGE, YOU'RE ABSOLUTELY CORRECT ON THAT.

2.0

2.2

I THINK MR. JESSEE AND I AND OUR EXPERT IN LOS ANGELES WERE TALKING TO THE GOVERNMENT WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT US HAVING THE MATERIAL, BEING ABLE TO GO OVER THAT MATERIAL, DO THE PROPER TRIAL PREP WITHOUT HAVING TO GO TO THE FBI TO LOOK AT IT; BUT, JUDGE, IF SHE IS RELEASED, THAT'S EASIER ACCESS TO EVERYTHING.

SO THAT'S SOMETHING THAT PENDING THE COURT'S ORDER ON, ONE OF THE REASONS WE'RE HERE TODAY ON RELEASE, I THINK THAT WILL MORE THAN LIKELY CAUSE THE NEXT CONVERSATION WITH MR. HARKER AND MR. WALCZEWSKI ABOUT WHAT WE'RE GOING TO DO TO THE UNDERLYING PROTECTIVE ORDER.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. YOU JUST SAID YOUR EXPERT IS IN LOS ANGELES?

MR. SHIPLEY: THAT'S CORRECT, JUDGE.

THE COURT: ONE OF THE THINGS YOU NEED TO DO,
OBVIOUSLY, I WOULD EXPECT YOU TO DO ANYWAY, IS COMMUNICATE
TO YOUR EXPERT WHAT THE REQUIREMENTS FOR DISCLOSURE ARE
GOING TO BE, AND, OBVIOUSLY YOUR EXPERT NEEDS TO GET THOSE
REPORTS, REPORT OR REPORTS TO YOU IN SUFFICIENT TIME THAT
YOU DON'T HAVE TO ASK FOR AN EXTENSION OF THAT DEADLINE.

MR. SHIPLEY: JUDGE, I'LL CONTACT HIM THIS AFTERNOON.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

2 ALL RIGHT. THEN IS THAT ALL WE CAN DO EXCEPT

3 | FOR THE BOND ISSUE?

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

BOND.

MR. HARKER: THAT'S EVERYTHING FROM THE GOVERNMENT, YOUR HONOR.

MR. SHIPLEY: EVERYTHING I HAVE, JUDGE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WELL, AS FAR AS THE MOTION FOR RELEASE ON BOND, I CONTINUE TO BE BOTHERED BY THE FACT THAT THIS HEARING WAS EVEN NECESSARY BECAUSE THERE WERE INDEED STATEMENTS MADE IN BOTH THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION AND THE ACCOMPANYING MEMORANDUM THAT HAVE PROVEN TO BE INACCURATE. I DO NOT MAKE ANY FINDING THAT THE LAWYERS WERE INTENTIONALLY MISREPRESENTING ANY FACT TO THE COURT; HOWEVER, I AGREE WITH MR. HARKER, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THERE IS A WRITTEN LEASE COVERING THAT JOHNSON CITY PROPERTY, THAT DR. YOU AND/OR HER HUSBAND WERE FULLY AWARE THAT THAT JOHNSON CITY PROPERTY WAS NOT AVAILABLE AT THAT TIME FOR HER TO RESIDE THERE; AND TO THE EXTENT THAT RAISES A CREDIBILITY PROBLEM WITH DR. YOU, THEN THAT CREDIBILITY PROBLEM EXTENDS BEYOND THE ISSUES

I WILL GIVE YOU WHAT I WILL TERM AS A

RAISED IN THE MOTION FOR BOND AND, FRANKLY, CALLS INTO

REQUIRED TO MAKE TO THIS COURT IF SHE WERE RELEASED ON

QUESTION THE CREDIBILITY OF CERTAIN PROMISES SHE WOULD BE

PRELIMINARY RULING ON THE MOTION. THERE WILL NOT BE A FINAL RULING ON THE MOTION, HOWEVER, UNTIL YOU RECEIVE THE COURT'S MEMORANDUM OPINION.

DESPITE MY CONCERN ABOUT THAT, IT APPEARS TO ME
THAT THE FINDINGS MADE IN THE COURT'S PRIOR ORDER, THE NOW
VACATED ORDER, WERE IN FACT JUSTIFIED, AND I SEE NO REASON
TO CHANGE THEM. I AM INCLINED TO GRANT THE MOTION FOR
BOND SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS.

DO YOU HAVE THAT, BY THE WAY?

AND IT WOULD BE OUR GOAL, OF COURSE, TO GET YOU A FINAL ORDER ON THIS BY WEEK'S END.

DESPITE THE GOVERNMENT'S ARGUMENT THAT THE RISK OF FLIGHT HAS IN FACT BECOME GREATER GIVEN THE CIRCUMSTANCES, I SIMPLY DO NOT AGREE. IN ADDITION, I THINK THE POSSIBILITY OF RISK OF HARM TO THE DEFENDANT AND/OR OTHER INMATES AT THE JAIL WHERE SHE IS CURRENTLY HOUSED AS A RESULT OF THE COVID-19 VIRUS ARE INDEED REAL DESPITE THE FACT THAT THERE DO NOT APPEAR TO BE ANY CONFIRMED CASES OF THE VIRUS AT THAT PARTICULAR FACILITY.

SEVERAL THINGS LEAD ME TO THE CONCLUSION THAT
THAT RISK IS VERY REAL AND THAT IT IS A SIGNIFICANT FACTOR
IN DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT TO RELEASE DR. YOU ON BOND
PENDING THE JANUARY -- EXCUSE ME, I SAID JANUARY AGAIN -JULY 21 TRIAL DATE.

FIRST OF ALL, THERE HAVE BEEN SOME SERIOUS OUT-

2.0

2.2

BREAKS IN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES ACROSS THE COUNTRY, AT LEAST ONE IN A BUREAU OF PRISONS FACILITY, BUT ALSO A NUMBER IN LOCAL JAILS. THAT RISK IS VERY REAL BECAUSE THERE ARE A LARGE NUMBER OF PEOPLE CONFINED IN A RELATIVELY SMALL SPACE WITH BOTH VISITORS AND NEW INMATES COMING INTO THOSE FACILITIES ON A REGULAR BASIS.

2.0

2.1

2.2

NOW, CERTAINLY THE PRECAUTIONS THAT MR. HARKER HAS DESCRIBED ARE IMPORTANT, BUT ONE OF THE THINGS THAT'S OCCURRED DURING THIS BREAK FROM COURT ACTIVITY IS THAT THE COURT HAS HAD A LOT OF TIME TO DO READING AND HAVE READ SOME ARTICLES JUST IN THE LAST FEW DAYS THAT INDICATE THAT PEOPLE WHO ARE COMPLETELY ASYMPTOMATIC NEVERTHELESS CAN SPREAD THE VIRUS.

I ALSO NOTE THAT IN THE LAST COUPLE OF WEEKS
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL HAS TAKEN SOME ACTIONS THAT ARE
SIGNIFICANT IN THAT RESPECT. NUMBER ONE, AT THE ATTORNEY
GENERAL'S DIRECTION THE BUREAU OF PRISONS IS CONDUCTING A
REVIEW IN AN ATTEMPT TO IDENTIFY INMATES WHO BECAUSE OF
AGE OR UNDERLYING MEDICAL CONDITIONS OR OTHER THINGS ARE
MORE SUSCEPTIBLE TO THE VIRUS AND PROVIDING FOR THEIR
RELEASE EARLIER THAN MIGHT OTHERWISE HAVE BEEN THE CASE TO
A HALFWAY HOUSE OR TO HOME INCARCERATION.

IN ADDITION, JUST TWO DAYS AGO THE ATTORNEY

GENERAL ISSUED A MEMO TO UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS, AMONG

OTHERS, THAT -- AND THIS IS MY PARAPHRASE -- DIRECTS THAT

CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO THE RISK, NOT ONLY ACTUAL RISK,
BUT POTENTIAL RISK TO A DEFENDANT BASED UPON INCARCERATION
WITHOUT BOND. I WON'T READ TOO MUCH INTO THE ATTORNEY
GENERAL'S MEMO, BUT CERTAINLY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
INDICATES THAT THE RISK FROM COVID-19 SHOULD BE A FACTOR
IN THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE ANALYSIS OF WHETHER
TO RECOMMEND BOND OR IN RESPONDING TO AND LITIGATING
MOTIONS FILED BY PREVIOUSLY DETAINED DEFENDANTS FOR BOND.

2.0

2.2

I HAVE TO ADMIT THAT THE ISSUE OF RELEASE FOR
THIS DEFENDANT IS A CLOSE CALL HERE, BUT I WOULD ALSO NOTE
THE BURDEN OF PROOF THAT'S ON THE GOVERNMENT IN THIS
RESPECT. SO I AM INCLINED, ALTHOUGH I WANT TO THINK ABOUT
IT JUST A LITTLE BIT AND DISCUSS IT WITH MY LAW CLERK, TO
GRANT THE MOTION FOR RELEASE. THAT RELEASE, HOWEVER,
WOULD BE SUBJECT TO SOME SIGNIFICANT CONDITIONS.

FIRST OF ALL, THE DEFENDANT WILL BE REQUIRED TO POST AN APPEARANCE BOND IN THE AMOUNT OF \$500,000, AT LEAST PARTIALLY SECURED BY A \$100,000 CASH DEPOSIT WITH THE COURT AND A DEED OF TRUST SECURING AT LEAST ONE OF THE PROPERTIES OWNED BY THE DEFENDANT AND HER HUSBAND EITHER IN WASHINGTON COUNTY, TENNESSEE OR IN ATLANTA, GEORGIA.

I -- THE PRETRIAL REPORT INDICATED A VALUE OF THE WASHINGTON COUNTY PROPERTY OF APPROXIMATELY \$250,000 AND OF THE ATLANTA PROPERTY OF APPROXIMATELY \$500,000. I

DR. YOU'S HUSBAND WILL HAVE TO SIGN THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS; AND ALTHOUGH COUNSEL WILL HAVE TO CONFIRM THIS WITH
THE CLERK'S OFFICE, I BELIEVE THAT WHAT ACTUALLY HAS TO BE
DONE IS A DEED OF TRUST PREPARED AND SIGNED BY BOTH
PARTIES IN FAVOR OF THE CLERK, I THINK THAT'S THE WAY
THAT'S DONE.

THE CLERK: I BELIEVE IT IS, YOUR HONOR.
THE COURT: SO THAT WOULD BE THE FIRST

CONDITION.

SECONDLY, THE DEFENDANT WILL BE REQUIRED TO
RESIDE IN THE NORTHEASTERN DIVISION OF THE UNITED STATES
DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE,

2.0

2.2

RESIDE IN THE NORTHEASTERN DIVISION OF THE UNITED STATES

DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE,

PRESUMABLY IN WASHINGTON COUNTY OR GREENE COUNTY, DURING

THE PERIOD OF THE BOND. SHE WILL BE SUBJECT TO HOME

DETENTION DURING THAT PERIOD OF TIME WITH ELECTRONIC

MONITORING. INITIALLY THE DEFENDANT WILL BE REQUIRED TO

COMPLY WITH ALL CDC REQUIREMENTS, INCLUDING THE TWO WEEK

QUARANTINE, AND I BELIEVE IT'S TWO WEEKS, QUARANTINE

DURING WHICH TIME SHE WOULD BE SUBJECT TO 24 HOUR A DAY, 7

DAY A WEEK DETENTION AT HOME. IN OTHER WORDS, SHE

COULDN'T LEAVE HOME FOR THAT -- I BELIEVE IT'S A 14 DAY

PERIOD. SOMEBODY NEEDS TO CONFIRM.

DID YOU CONFIRM IT WAS 14 DAYS?

PROBATION OFFICER: NO, YOUR HONOR, BUT I

WILL.

THE COURT: SOMEBODY NEEDS TO CONFIRM THAT IT'S 14 DAYS. WHATEVER THAT REQUIREMENT IS, SHE NEEDS TO BE UNDER QUARANTINE. AFTER THAT, SHE WILL BE PERMITTED TO LEAVE HER RESIDENCE FOR ONLY ONE OF THE FOLLOWING REASONS: NUMBER ONE, TO SEE A DOCTOR IF SHE NEEDS TO DO THAT; SECONDLY, TO VISIT A PHARMACY TO PICK UP A PRESCRIPTION; THIRD, TO GO TO THE GROCERY STORE; AND, FOURTH, TO MEET WITH HER LAWYERS AT WHATEVER LOCATION IS REQUIRED BY HER ATTORNEYS, EITHER AT ONE OF THEIR OFFICES OR POSSIBLY AT THE FBI'S REGIONAL OFFICE IN JOHNSON CITY.

2.0

2.2

LET ME GO BACK TO THE RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT.

OBVIOUSLY, SHE MUST RESIDE AT A PLACE APPROVED BY THE

UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICE AS A SUITABLE RESIDENCE.

AND GIVEN THE FACT THAT INTERNET ACCESS IS USUALLY WIRED

INTO THESE APARTMENT COMPLEXES, SHE WILL SURRENDER AND NOT

POSSESS ANY DEVICE ON WHICH SHE MIGHT ACCESS THE INTERNET,

COMPUTER, CELL PHONE, I-PAD -- I JUST LEARNED RECENTLY

THAT YOU CAN CONNECT TO THE INTERNET WITH AN X-BOX, I

DIDN'T KNOW THAT -- BUT ANY DEVICE THAT'S CAPABLE OF

CONNECTING TO THE INTERNET.

DURING THE PERIOD OF THE BOND -- OH, AND

BECAUSE IT IS HOME DETENTION, THE LOCATION WILL HAVE TO

HAVE A LANDLINE TELEPHONE. DURING THE PERIOD OF THE BOND,

THE DEFENDANT WILL BE REQUIRED TO PLACE A CALL FROM THAT

LANDLINE TO HER SUPERVISING UNITED STATES PROBATION

1 OFFICER AT LEAST TWICE DAILY. AND I'M TOLD THAT THE 2 TECHNOLOGY ALLOWS THE PROBATION OFFICE TO CONFIRM THAT THE 3 CALL, CALL WAS IN FACT MADE FROM THAT LANDLINE. 4 ADDITION, THE PROBATION OFFICER IS AUTHORIZED TO MAKE 5 RANDOM PHONE CALLS TO THE DEFENDANT TO CONFIRM THAT SHE IS PRESENT AT THAT LOCATION. 6 7 NOW, BECAUSE THE DEFENDANT DOES NOT HAVE A 8 DRIVER'S LICENSE AND WILL NOT BE PERMITTED TO OBTAIN A 9 DRIVER'S LICENSE, SHE WILL HAVE TO ARRANGE FOR ANY NECESSARY TRANSPORTATION. 10 11 DID I MISS ANYTHING? 12 PROBATION OFFICER: YOUR HONOR, WILL SHE BE 13 REQUIRED TO PAY FOR HER ELECTRONIC MONITORING? 14 THE COURT: SHE WILL, THE ELECTRONIC MONITORING 15 WILL BE AT HER EXPENSE. 16 PROBATION OFFICER: AND GIVEN THE CURRENT 17 SITUATION WITH COVID-19 AND EVERYTHING, WE'RE NOT SURE 18 WHEN WE WILL BE ABLE TO HOOK HER UP. 19 THE COURT: I'M NOT GOING TO PUT A TIME LIMIT 2.0 ON THAT, I UNDERSTAND THAT THERE ARE SOME TIME CONSTRAINTS 21 ON GETTING ALL THAT HOOKED UP. 2.2 PROBATION OFFICER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: BUT I WOULD LIKE IT HOOKED UP AS 23 24 SOON AS POSSIBLE AFTER SHE IS RELEASED, OBVIOUSLY. 25 PROBATION OFFICER: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: BEYOND THAT, SHE WILL BE SUBJECT TO THE USUAL CONDITIONS OF BOND.

2.0

2.2

IN ADDITION TO WHAT I'VE ALREADY SAID ABOUT

CONTACT WITH THE PROBATION OFFICE, SHE WILL BE REQUIRED TO

REPORT ON A REGULAR BASIS TO THE UNITED STATES PROBATION

OFFICE AND TO COOPERATE FULLY WITH ALL PRETRIAL SERVICE

OFFICERS OR THEIR DESIGNEES; AND SHE MUST REFRAIN FROM ANY

VERBAL OR PHYSICAL ABUSE OF ANY PRETRIAL SERVICE OFFICER

OR OTHER OFFICIAL IN THE PERFORMANCE OF HIS OR HER DUTIES.

THE DEFENDANT MUST REFRAIN FROM POSSESSING A FIREARM, AMMUNITION, A DESTRUCTIVE DEVICE OR ANY OTHER KIND OF DANGEROUS WEAPON.

AND THIS SAYS EXECUTE A BAIL BOND WITH SOLVENT SURETIES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$100,000. I INTEND FOR THERE TO BE A DEPOSIT WITH THE CLERK OF \$100,000, ALL RIGHT.

AND IF SHE HAS ANY PASSPORT IN HER POSSESSION,
THAT MUST BE SURRENDERED TO THE UNITED STATES PROBATION
OFFICE, AND SHE IS PROHIBITED FROM OBTAINING ANY NEW
PASSPORT.

SHE MUST HAVE NO CONTACT WITH KNOWN CONVICTED FELONS, DRUG DEALERS, DRUG USERS, CODEFENDANTS OR ANY PERSON WHO VIOLATES THE LAW.

SHE MUST REPORT ANY CONTACT WITH LAW ENFORCE-MENT PERSONNEL, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY ARRESTS, OUESTIONING OR TRAFFIC STOP TO THE PRETRIAL OFFICER AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

2.1

2.2

AND, OBVIOUSLY, SHE MUST APPEAR AT ANY TIME

THAT HER APPEARANCE IS REQUIRED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS

CASE. SHE MUST REMAIN IN CONTACT ON A REGULAR BASIS WITH

HER ATTORNEYS AND COOPERATE FULLY WITH HER ATTORNEYS.

AND UPON THE ENTRY OF THE COURT'S ORDER, I
UNDERSTAND THIS BOND CAN ACTUALLY BE E-MAILED TO HER AT
THE DETENTION FACILITY AND SHE CAN SIGN IT FROM THERE?

THE CLERK: YOUR HONOR --

THE COURT: IS THAT WHAT HAPPENS?

THE CLERK: -- WASHINGTON COUNTY DOES NOT ALLOW
THAT, THE OTHER ONES DO, AND SO THIS NEEDS TO BE GIVEN TO
HER COUNSEL AND THEN TAKEN TO HER, THAT'S MY UNDERSTANDING
THAT WASHINGTON COUNTY DOES NOT ALLOW THAT.

THE COURT: MR. SHIPLEY, MR. JESSEE, DID YOU BOTH HEAR THAT? WASHINGTON COUNTY WON'T ALLOW IT TO BE SIGNED ELECTRONICALLY, AND THIS IS GOING TO REQUIRE THAT IT BE TAKEN TO HER AT THE JAIL TO BE SIGNED, WHICH IS -- I DIDN'T KNOW WASHINGTON COUNTY HAD DONE THAT, BUT THAT'S UNWISE, BUT APPARENTLY THE CONDITIONS THEY HAVE.

MR. SHIPLEY: JUDGE, I'LL TAKE CARE OF IT, ACCORDINGLY.

THE COURT: AND ONCE IT'S SIGNED BY THE DEFENDANT, THEN IT CAN BE SUBMITTED TO THE COURT, AND I WILL SIGN IT.

1 ALL RIGHT. DID I MISS ANY CONDITION THAT 2 ANYBODY WANTED TO DISCUSS? 3 I THINK, AS MR. HARKER SAID, THAT DOES LARGELY 4 TRACK THE CONDITIONS SUGGESTED BY THE GOVERNMENT. 5 MR. HARKER: I THINK IT DOES, YOUR HONOR. 6 THANK YOU. 7 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 8 MR. HARKER: YOUR HONOR, IF I MAY? THE COURT: YES, YOU MAY. 9 MR. HARKER: I UNDERSTAND THAT THE COURT HAS 10 11 ONLY ISSUED A PRELIMINARY ORDER AT THIS TIME --12 THE COURT: YES. MR. HARKER: -- AND THAT IT WILL TAKE THE 13 14 MATTER UNDER ADVISEMENT AND, AS YOUR HONOR SAID, DISCUSS 15 IT WITH THE CLERK. IF THE COURT DOES ULTIMATELY ENTER 16 THIS ORDER, I'VE BEEN INSTRUCTED TO MOVE THE COURT THAT 17 THE COURT DELAY THE EXECUTION OF THAT ORDER FOR 72 HOURS 18 SO THAT THE UNITED STATES CAN COMPLETE ITS CONSULTATION 19 WITH THE SOLICITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE WHETHER OR NOT TO SEEK 20 AN APPEAL. THE COURT: I'LL TAKE THAT REQUEST UNDER 21 2.2 ADVISEMENT AS WELL. 23 MR. HARKER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 24 THE COURT: I JUST WAS LOOKING AT A SIXTH 25 CIRCUIT DOCKET SHEET EARLIER TODAY, AND THERE'S AN

1	EMERGENCY MOTION THAT'S BEEN PENDING BEFORE THE SIXTH
2	CIRCUIT FOR ABOUT FOUR WEEKS THAT THEY HAVEN'T RULED ON,
3	SO THE ODDS THAT YOU GET A QUICK RULING OUT OF THE SIXTH
4	CIRCUIT ON ANYTHING ARE PRETTY SLIM, BUT CERTAINLY THE
5	GOVERNMENT CAN DO WHATEVER IT DECIDES TO DO IN THAT
6	RESPECT.
7	MR. HARKER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
8	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ANYTHING ELSE?
9	MR. HARKER: NO, YOUR HONOR.
10	MR. SHIPLEY: NOTHING FURTHER, YOUR HONOR.
11	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. LET'S KEEP THIS CASE
12	MOVING AND TRY TO GET THIS CASE TRIED IN JULY, AND THAT
13	MAKES THE NECESSARY ARRANGEMENTS THAT NEED TO BE MADE WITH
14	RESPECT TO THESE DEPOSITIONS OF CONSIDERABLE IMPORTANCE,
15	AND SO I'LL LOOK FORWARD TO YOUR STATUS REPORT IN A WEEK
16	ABOUT THE, ABOUT THE STATUS OF THAT.
17	MR. SHIPLEY: THANK YOU.
18	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU ALL VERY
19	MUCH. THAT WILL CONCLUDE THE COURT'S HEARING.
20	MR. HARKER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
21	THE DEFENDANT: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
22	THE COURT: MR. OVERBEY, GOOD TO SEE YOU.
23	MR. OVERBEY: GOOD TO SEE YOU.
24	(PROCEEDINGS ARE CONCLUDED AT 3:12 P.M.)
25	I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM

THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER. KAREN J. BRADLEY/S 04/10/2020 SIGNATURE OF COURT REPORTER DATE